

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
DAVID, JEAN.—Les Scythes et les Tartares dans Voltaire et quelques-uns de ses contemporains,	1
ROWBOTHAM, ARNOLD H.—La Mothe le Vayer's 'Vertu des Payens' and Eighteenth-Century Cosmopolitanism,	10
FRAUCHIGER, FRITZ.—A Note on August Lewald,	15
ROSITZKE, HARRY A.—High German Vowel-Quantities,	18
SPITZER, LEO.—'Languages' dans "Pèlerinage de Charlemagne," V. 200,	20
CAMPBELL, LILY B.—A Note for Baconians,	21
RINGLER, WILLIAM.—An Early Reference to Longinus,	23
MALONE, KEMP.—Some Linguistic Studies of 1935 and 1936,	24

REVIEWS:—

EDWIN ROEDDER, <i>Volksprache und Wortschatz des Badischen Frankenlandes</i> . [Oert Selmer.]	46
C. C. ZIPPERMANN, <i>Gottfried Keller Bibliographie 1844-1934</i> ; R. T. HARDAWAY, <i>The Revision of C. F. Meyer's 'Novellen'</i> ; LENA F. DAHME, <i>Women in the Life and Art of C. F. Meyer</i> . [R. B. Rouleston.]	49
E. M. BUTLER, <i>The Tyranny of Greece over Germany</i> . [Ludwig Edelstein.]	53
W. H. BRUFORD, <i>Germany in the Eighteenth Century</i> . [K. G. Wendriner.]	56
E. H. SEHET und T. STABCK (eds.), <i>Notkers des Deutschen Werke, II</i> [F. H. Wilkens.]	59
RAY HEFFNER (ed.), <i>The Faerie Queene, Book Four</i> . [H. J. O. Grierson.]	59
MARJORIE NICOLSON, <i>A World in the Moon</i> . [F. R. Johnson.]	61
C. L. FINNEY, <i>The Evolution of Keats's Poetry</i> . [M. R. Ridley.]	62
J. W. ABERDEIN, John Galt; F. V. LIVINGSTONE and H. E. ROLLINS (eds.), <i>Charles Dickens's Letters to Charles Lever</i> . [A. B. Hopkins.]	65
RUDOLF KIRK, <i>Mr. Pepys upon the State of Christ-Hospital</i> . [S. V. Larkey.]	67
V.-F. KOENIG (ed.), <i>Le Conte de Poitiers</i> ; J. Linskill (ed.), <i>Saint Léger</i> ; G. DE POERCK, <i>Introduction à la Fleur des Histoires de Jean Mansel</i> . [Grace Frank.]	67

BRIEF MENTION: J. A. KELLY, *German Visitors to English Theaters in the Eighteenth Century*; W. BAGDASARIANZ, *William Blake*; A. SEN, *Studies in Shelley*; L. HOWARD (ed.), *Daily Meditations*, by PHILIP PAIN; V. LANGE, *Die Lyrik und ihr Publikum im England des 18. Jahrhunderts*; R. L. GRISMER and E. ATKINS (translators), *The Book of Apollonius*; I. SCHULTZ, *Bildhaftigkeit im französischen Argot*; H. RYLAND, *The Sources of the Play Cyrano de Bergerac*; E. WINDLER (ed.), *Das Bremer mittelniederdeutsche Arzneibuch des Arnoldus Donelhey*; A. S. F. GOW, A. E. HOUSMAN; W. EBISCH and L. L. SCHÜCKING, *Supplement for the Years 1930-5 to A Shakespeare Bibliography; Romana; Huntington Library Lists and Quarterly*; G. ATKINSON, *Supplément au Répertoire bibliographique se rapportant à la littérature géographique française de la Renaissance*,

70

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER

KEMP MALONE

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

HAZELTON SPENCER

C. S. SINGLETON

Advisory Editors

E. Feiss, Grace Frank, J. C. French, R. Heffner, E. Malakis, R. B. Roulston, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Prices of the current annual volume is \$5.00 for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NRD.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RE.*, *SP.*, *RES.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

ALFIERI

BY

CHARLES R. D. MILLER

A new biography of the Italian poet, dramatist, and patriot Vittorio Alfieri (1749-1803). Although Robert Southey, William Dean Howells and others have written of him, this is the first full account of his life in English. The author is a teacher of Italian literature at Harvard. (\$2.25)

THE BAYARD PRESS

Williamsport, Pa.

ELH

A Journal of English Literary History

ELH, the only American journal devoted exclusively to anglistics, is now published for the Tudor and Stuart Club by The Johns Hopkins Press. Beginning with March, 1937, it will publish annually a critical bibliography of the Romantic period, prepared by Professor Walter Graham and associates.

Issued quarterly beginning with March. Subscription, \$2.50 a year.

Subscriptions and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

BALTIMORE

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of Congress of July 16, 1924.

ore
the
ipt
lea
the
of
no-
not
P.,
ora
ess

Modern Language Notes

Volume LIII

JANUARY, 1938

Number 1

LES SCYTHES ET LES TARTARES DANS VOLTAIRE ET QUELQUES-UNS DE SES CONTEMPORAINS

L'antiquité avait déjà douté que la civilisation soit un bienfait et elle avait tourné les yeux vers les sauvages comme vers des modèles d'une vie plus simple et meilleure. Les Scythes avant tout attirèrent son attention sous ce rapport. Elle les regarda comme des exemples frappants d'hommes nobles, austères, désintéressés, vertueux en un mot, auxquels un climat rigoureux permettait de manifester leurs qualités mâles. Cette tradition persista jusqu'au second siècle de l'ère chrétienne. A cette époque un contact plus étroit avec les Scythes fit triompher l'opinion défavorable d'Ovide.¹ Malgré ce changement, c'est l'attitude primitiviste qui domine encore au dix-huitième siècle. Voltaire, toutefois, reprend vivement les écrivains soit antiques soit modernes qui reproduisent le cliché du "bon Scythe," car il est soucieux de bien mettre en lumière la valeur de la civilisation gréco-romaine et de la défendre contre ceux qui placent le bonheur ou la perfection dans un passé toujours plus lointain. Lui-même pourtant devait tomber dans ce qu'il reprochait aux apologistes des Scythes parce qu'il était nourri des classiques. Ainsi que nous allons le voir, il représente les Scythes comme plus nobles tout de même que les Tartares en qui il voyait leurs descendants. Les Scythes et les Tartares attirèrent aussi son attention parce qu'ils servaient à des sociologues et à des savants de son temps pour étayer des thèses d'intérêt général auxquelles il était opposé.

Une étude sur les Scythes et les Tartares amène à une considération d'ordre plus général, à savoir, quel a été l'apport des nomades à la civilisation. L'anthropologue Kroeber² trouve que ce pro-

¹ Lovejoy and Boas, *A Documentary History of Primitivism and Related Ideas*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1935, I, 339.

² Kroeber, A. L., *Anthropology*, New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1923, pp. 274, 463, 472.

blème a été jusqu'ici mal étudié et que: "The intensive study of the interior Asiatic peoples from both prehistoric and historic sources . . . will prove one of the most illuminating contributions to the history of general civilisation," parce que les nomades ont été le lien entre l'Europe et l'Extrême-Orient, ce que l'historien du progrès, jusqu'à une époque récente, a trop perdu de vue. Les Russes de leur côté s'intéressent à leurs lointains ancêtres, comme le prouvent les collections d'antiquités scythes des musées de Moscou, de Kiev, d'Ekaterinoslav et surtout de l'Ermitage à Leningrad. Borovka³ parle du "haut degré de civilisation," de la richesse en or, de l'art très individuel et impressionniste des Scythes du Kouban au sixième siècle avant Jésus-Christ.

Le dix-huitième siècle, sous l'influence de son admiration pour le Chinois agriculteur et sous celle de ses physiocrates, se montra particulièrement hostile au nomade tout en faisant exception pour les Scythes. De toute façon, il est exagéré de dire, ainsi que l'a fait Oswald Spengler, que Voltaire n'avait pas articulé les nomades à sa théorie du progrès, car il l'a fait pour les Scythes et Tartares.

Voltaire lui-même signale, en la déplorant, la tradition favorable au Scythe: "Par quelle malignité secrète, par quelle éloquence déplacée, tant d'historiens ont-ils fait de si grands éloges des Scythes qu'ils ne connaissaient pas?"⁴ Ces historiens, qui veulent imiter la harangue vertueuse que Quinte-Curce a mise dans la bouche des Scythes parlant à Alexandre, sont des rhéteurs.⁵ "Rollin a beau transcrire tout ce qu'on a dit de la justice de ces anciens Scythes qui pillèrent si souvent l'Asie et qui mangeaient des hommes dans l'occasion, il trouve un peu d'incrédulité chez les honnêtes gens."⁶ C'est le désintéressement des Scythes, leur "dédain manifeste" de l'or et de l'argent que vante Rollin, à l'instar de Cicéron: "O how happy was this ignorance, how vastly preferable this savage state is to our pretended politeness."⁷ Lenglet du Fresnoy⁸ ajoute la sagesse à ce tableau: "La sobriété et la sagesse

³ Borovka, G., *Scythian Art*, New York, Stokes, 1928, pp. 16-30, 68.

⁴ Voltaire, édition Moland (c'est cette édition que nous citerons), *Essai sur les Mœurs*, XI, introduction, p. 42.

⁵ *Histoire de la Russie*, XVI, p. 617.

⁶ *Dictionnaire Philosophique*, article *Histoire*, p. 355.

⁷ Rollin, Ch., *The Ancient History of the Egyptians, Carthaginians, etc.*, from the French, Boston, Walker, 1823, I, 259 ii.

⁸ *Méthode pour étudier l'histoire etc.* Paris, Gandoin, 1729, Tome 2, XLII, p. 367.

ont fait peupler les hommes en Scythie plus que dans le reste de l'Asie." Diderot reproduit, avec la même absence de critique, tous ces traits, parle de la "justice" des Scythes, de leur horreur pour l'infidélité conjugale et il utilise le cliché comme une formule magique, pour prouver sa thèse: "Nous nous occuperons donc dans cet endroit . . . de l'éloge de la nature humaine lorsqu'elle est abandonnée à elle-même, sans loi, sans prêtres et sans roi."⁹ L'idée qu'il exprime ici, que les Scythes ont ignoré les "superstitions," en l'occurrence les rites, les prêtres et les rois, lui est commune avec Voltaire. Les Scythes, aux yeux de Rousseau, furent ainsi que les anciens Romains et les Germains, des gens qui "préservés de cette contagion des vaines connaissances, ont, par leurs vertus, fait leur propre bonheur et l'exemple des autres nations."¹⁰

Montesquieu et Buffon adoptèrent une attitude différente. Montesquieu ne trouve pas que les conquérants Scythes et Tartares aient fait quoi que ce soit pour la civilisation. Il excuse pourtant leur cruauté en montrant qu'elle venait du droit international qu'ils pratiquaient et qu'ils s'attendaient à trouver chez les autres peuples: si l'ennemi était en force très supérieure, ils ne lui opposaient pas de résistance héroïque mais ils allaient grossir son armée sans livrer de combat.¹¹ Aux yeux de Buffon la condition nomade est "la plus méprisable de l'espèce humaine," au-dessous de celle du sauvage et elle constitue encore un péril actuel.¹² Les Tartares notamment sont laids, petits, sans courage, voleurs, sans pudeur et offrent leurs femmes aux étrangers.¹³ Les Tartares mongols selon Montesquieu, Voltaire et Buffon, grâce à leur contact avec les Chinois sont plus civilisés et, selon celui-ci, ils sont même moins laids que les autres. L'historien tartare Abul-Ghazi¹⁴ est d'un avis exactement opposé. Les Calmoucks, ces purs Tartares, sont de très honnêtes gens qui vivent dans le plus beau climat du monde au lieu que les Mongols. . . .

Montesquieu, Buffon et Voltaire ont considéré les Scythes et les Tartares surtout sous leur aspect de migrants et les ont regardés

⁹ Diderot, éd. Assézat, Paris, Garnier, 1876, xvii, 110.

¹⁰ Ed. Hachette. *Disc. sur Arts et Sc.*, p. 6.

¹¹ *Esp. des Lois*, Liv. xviii, ch. xx.

¹² *Époques de la Nature*, éd. Picard, Paris, Garnier, 221.

¹³ *Hist. nat.*, Paris, Imprimerie Royale, 1749, iii, 374-82.

¹⁴ *A General History of the Turks, Moguls and Tartars; from the French*, London, J. Knapton, 1730, ii, 536, 502-3.

comme des barbares destructeurs de la civilisation. Voltaire trouve que ces "sauvages du Caucase et des déserts"¹⁵ étaient "affamés de carnage et de rapines," des "barbares craints du reste du monde."¹⁶ Il voit leur pays comme une étendue inculte, une plaine qui inspire de l'horreur. Les Scythes, selon lui, en effet "ne furent jamais que des destructeurs" qui ont "désolé les beaux climats de la Roumanie où Adrien et Trajan avaient bâti des villes,"¹⁷ et les Tartares "n'ont jamais rien cultivé."¹⁸ Voltaire perd de vue qu'une partie de ces nomades, une fois revenus chez eux, se livrait à l'agriculture ainsi que l'avait déjà signalé Moréri pour les Tartares de Crimée.¹⁹ Il parle ailleurs du bas prix des denrées dans leur pays, ce qui s'expliquerait difficilement s'ils ne cultivaient pas le sol.²⁰ De même qu'il a exagéré la désolation des climats scythes, Voltaire a représenté la vie des Tartares plus austère qu'elle n'était. Il a certainement connu l'encyclopédie des voyages de Prévost qu'il suit parfois de très près, or, cet ouvrage rapporte Marco Polo à l'effet que les Tartares avaient des tentes légères de campagne.²¹ Il a dû savoir par Abul-Ghazi qu'il cite, que certains Calmoucks²² même avaient des habitations fixes qu'ils construisaient rondes, mais il pousse les couleurs. Les Tartares couchent "l'hiver sur la neige et l'été sur la rosée." Il ne leur faut "ni tentes, ni provisions, ni bagages."²³

Si l'on pense que pour Voltaire ni l'état de nature, ni l'état social ne sont un état de guerre, que donc la guerre est un fait anormal; si l'on se rappelle son impatient mépris à l'égard des fondateurs du droit international, Grotius et Puffendorff, on peut croire qu'il n'y avait pas, à ses yeux, de lois de la guerre, qu'en conséquence tout acte d'hostilité était d'une barbarie inouïe. De là il était naturel qu'il exagérât la cruauté des conquérants scythes et tartares. D'un autre côté lorsqu'il décrit ceux-ci chez eux, hors de

¹⁵ *Hist. de Russie*, xvi, 617.

¹⁶ *Princesse de Babylone*, 1768, xxi, 401.

¹⁷ *Essai sur les Mœurs*, xxix, 319.

¹⁸ *Hist. de Russie*, xvi, 406.

¹⁹ *Article Tartares*, p. 429, col. 2. Paris, Coignard, 1732.

²⁰ *Hist. de Charles XII*, xvi, 272.

²¹ *Hist. gén. des voyages*, Paris, Didot, 1746-1770, vii, 349.

²² Abul-Ghazi, *op. cit.*, II, 410.

²³ *Essai M.*, lx, 485 et introduction, 151; 482 et 484.

l'époque de leurs migrations, il ne reconnaît pas en eux, dans leur morale privée, autant de barbarie qu'on pourrait imaginer. Cette attitude provient aussi d'un principe de sa philosophie générale. Comme Diderot et Rousseau, Voltaire se rattache au système de Condillac pour qui l'homme n'est originellement ni bon ni mauvais. Voltaire le verrait même plutôt bon à l'état de nature, d'une bonté assez consciente. C'est la bonté consciente que le scythe Indatire reconnaît chez les siens, dans la tragédie qui prend cette race pour sujet, lorsqu'il déclare :

Nous sommes tous égaux sur ces rives si chères,
Sans rois et sujets, tous libres et tous frères.²⁴

Diderot, par contre, la croit inconsciente : " Les Scythes grossiers ont joui d'un bonheur que les peuples de la Grèce n'ont point connue. Quoi donc ! l'ignorance des vices serait-elle préférable à la connaissance de la vertu ? " et il acquiesce.²⁵ La période des Encyclopédistes, ainsi que l'a remarqué René Hubert, s'est refusée à croire aux vices extrêmes de la nature humaine. Les sacrifices humains, croit Voltaire, ont dû être rares chez les Scythes, autrement les familles auraient bientôt immolé les prêtres eux-mêmes. Il relève les paroles de Montesquieu selon lesquelles les Tartares n'épousent jamais leurs mères mais parfois leurs filles. Aucun de ces cas n'est vrai, selon lui, cela est " contre la nature. " Toutefois on remarque, en contradiction avec sa conception, que la jeune Obéide est obligée de par la loi scythe à tuer Indatire parce que celui-ci est le meurtrier de son mari. C'est alors Grimm qui rappelle Voltaire à l'ordre : " Cette loi ne paraît pas naturelle et je ne crois pas qu'il y ait jamais eu une nation sous le soleil qui ait commis au sexe le plus faible le soin de la vengeance sur le sexe le plus fort. " ²⁶ Scythes et Tartares sont confondus dans un commun éloge, lorsque Voltaire, à la fois sous l'empire de la tradition antique et d'après les rapports de Strahlemborg, accorde à ces nomades la vertu d'hospitalité : " Les Scythes, leurs ancêtres, leur ont transmis ce respect inviolable pour l'hospitalité qu'ils ont conservé. " ²⁷

L'auteur utilise habilement ces sauvages pour établir son im-

²⁴ *Scythes*, I, 1.

²⁵ Diderot, éd. Assézat, XVII, 110, article *Scythes*.

²⁶ Corr., éd. Tourneux, Paris, Garnier, 1879. Janvier, 1767, VII, 223.

²⁷ *Hist. Charles XII*, XVI, 272 et *Essai sur les Mœurs*, introduction, 12.

portante thèse de la perpétuité du monothéisme déiste, c'est à dire dégagé de superstitions, à travers l'histoire. Il fallait attribuer cette religion à des nomades parce que, vivant dans les déserts, ils n'ont autour d'eux "aucun objet qui fixe leur crainte et leur adoration."²⁷ Ils rapportent donc ces sentiments dans le ciel à un seul objet qu'ils appelleront "le Maître, le Seigneur." Arrivé à ce point, il fallait éviter de faire honneur de ce culte élevé aux nomades juifs et c'est à quoi Voltaire a pris soin. Il a trouvé Scythes et Tartares tout indiqués pour prendre leur place. La majorité de ceux-ci "pour tout culte sacrifiait à Dieu quelques animaux une fois l'an. Il n'est point dit qu'ils aient jamais immolé d'hommes à la divinité ni qu'ils aient cru à un être malfaisant et puissant tel que le diable."²⁸ Voltaire simplifie. Gmelin qu'il cite avait parlé du monothéisme des Tartares Tschuwasches, mais aussi de leurs divinités subalternes, il avait mentionné leurs prêtres, leurs églises en bois près de Kazan.²⁹ La comparaison entre le juif et le Scythe paraît en un endroit où il mentionne d'une part les présents symboliques d'un roi scythe à Darius pour montrer que l'emblème des sauvages qui nous occupent était celui du courage; de l'autre, l'allégorie de Jérémie, des chaînes pour les juifs, symbole de l'impuissance de ce peuple.³⁰

Voltaire établit entre le Scythe et le Tartare une différence qui apparaît sensible dans *Zaïre*. Orosmane, dépeint sans jalousie amoureuse, pourrait bien se réclamer des vertus de ses compatriotes et contemporains, au lieu de cela il préfère, pour se faire valoir, vanter les qualités des ancêtres:

Des Scythes mes aïeux je garde la fierté,
Leurs mœurs, leurs passions, leur générosité.³¹

Nérestan emploie le mot "Tartare" plutôt que "Scythe" pour marquer son mépris d'Orosmane:

Et je vais donc apprendre à Lusignan trahi,
Qu'un Tartare est le Dieu que sa fille a choisi.³²

La tragédie des "Scythes" offre aussi un exemple du sauvage

²⁷ *Essai M.*, LX, 479.

²⁸ Prévost, *op. cit.*, *Voyage de Gmelin*, XVIII, 89, 96.

²⁹ *Dictionnaire philos.*, art. *Emblème*.

³¹ *Zaïre*, III, sc. 1.

³² *Zaïre*, III, 4.

héroïque et vertueux. Selon Baldensperger au contraire, l'auteur montrerait en ces nomades, à mesure qu'avance la pièce; "la rudesse inhérente à cette rusticité, plaisante au premier abord, grosse de barbarie en son fond."³³ Baldensperger donne trop d'importance à une lettre à Frédéric où Voltaire déclare avoir voulu comparer les Parisiens et les Suisses pour donner le désavantage à ceux-ci en les identifiant aux Scythes. Le peuple au nom duquel parle Indatire ne peut guère être identifié aux Suisses qui fournissaient des mercenaires à tous les princes de l'Europe; on ne prête généralement pas un fond héroïque à la population de l'Helvétie, du moins lorsqu'on pense à celle du dix-huitième siècle. Par ailleurs le portrait avantageux du Scythe ne se dément pas vers la fin de la tragédie comme le dit Baldensperger, quoique le mot final soit pour les civilisés souvent injustes mais accessibles à la pitié. Indatire, le héros de cette race, oppose au quatrième acte un fier langage au persan Athamare qui veut exciter son ambition à joindre l'armée persane en le dégoûtant de l'égalité républicaine, il répond qu'il ne se battra que pour la défense des siens: "Nul ne vend parmi nous son honneur et sa vie."

On place encore souvent de nos jours en Asie centrale les origines d'un peuple européen lorsqu'elles sont obscures. Cette vue d'origine biblique était largement répandue au dix-huitième siècle. Du Fresnoy l'expose comme sienne. La Scythie aurait été "la mère d'une infinité de peuples" puisque les enfants de Japhet, Gomer, fondateur du peuple celte, et Magog, du peuple scythe, se seraient établis au nord de la Caspienne et que d'eux viendraient entre autres, Gaulois, Germains, Huns, Chinois.³⁴ Rousseau est entièrement de cet avis parce que les premières migrations ne viennent pas des climats heureux.³⁵ Buffon et de Pauw, à la suite de Chardin, croient les Chinois et les Scythes une même race.³⁶ Voltaire, pour miner cette théorie, a tenu à regarder les différents peuples comme autochtones, niant pratiquement le concept de race. Buffon et de Pauw, à son avis, se trompent. La Chine n'a pas été peuplée de Scythes comme ils l'ont cru car les mœurs et la langue des deux

³³ Baldensperger, *RCC.*, 32 (a): 679—1931.

³⁴ Du Fresnoy, *op. cit.*, II, 367.

³⁵ Rousseau, éd. Hachette, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, 389.

³⁶ Buffon, *Hist. nat.*, III, 380; de Pauw, II, 347.

peuples étaient trop opposées.³⁷ Les Celtes ne viennent pas de l'hébreu Gomer ni les Scythes de Magog.³⁸ Voltaire a bien dit qu'on ne pouvait savoir quel avait été le premier peuple,³⁹ pourtant la lecture de ses ouvrages laisse une impression confuse sur ce sujet, car tantôt il implique que les Hindous, parce qu'ils vivaient dans un climat fertile, avaient dû être les premiers à se réunir en corps de peuple,⁴⁰ tantôt, comme nous allons voir, il se range ou paraît se ranger à l'hypothèse qu'il combat ouvertement. Il voit les Scythes partout: "Ce vaste réservoir d'hommes ignorants et belliqueux a vomi ces inondations dans presque tout notre hémisphère."⁴¹ Comment se seraient-ils déplacés ainsi sans essaimer? A l'entendre, les Scythes au VII^{ème} siècle av. J. C. envahirent⁴² l'Egypte alors que le roi de ce pays les éloigna par des présents.⁴³ Il exagère beaucoup leur rôle de migrants et de conquérants lorsqu'il dit qu' "ils détruisirent l'empire romain au cinquième siècle et conquirent l'Espagne et tout ce que les Romains avaient eu en Afrique."⁴⁴ La thèse biblique se retrouve même ici puisque Germains et Scythes sont confondus, elle réapparaît ailleurs quand il assimile les Celtes aux Francs.⁴⁵

Parallèlement à l'hypothèse qui vient d'être étudiée, une théorie avancée par l'astronome Bailly plaçait en Asie centrale l'origine des sciences. Bailly l'étayait sur le fait qu'Hindous et Chinois vénéraient quelques montagnes de la Tartarie indiquant par là leur premier séjour,⁴⁶ que l'état de l'astronomie en Chine, dans l'Inde et la Chaldée indiquait plutôt les débris que les éléments d'une science qui par conséquent avait dû venir d'ailleurs.⁴⁶ Voltaire répond que les nuits de l'Inde et de la Chaldée plus belles que celles de la Tartarie ont dû porter les hommes à faire là les premières observations et calculs astronomiques,⁴⁷ et que d'ailleurs il n'est jamais venu de la Scythie que la barbarie. De Pauw et Buffon suivent l'opinion de Bailly. Placer ainsi la civilisation au nord s'accordait bien avec la théorie de la nébuleuse de Buffon qui s'est refroidie peu à peu vers le nord

³⁷ *Fragments sur l'histoire générale*, 1773, xxix, 230.

³⁸ *Essai M.*, introd. 161 et *Dict. Philos.*, article *Celtes*.

³⁹ *Essai M.*, introd., 41.

⁴¹ *Op. cit.*, LX, 478.

⁴⁰ *Essai M.*, introd., p. 10.

⁴² *Op. cit.*, introd., 60.

⁴³ *Larousse*, XX^e siècle, art. *Scythes* (c. 1934).

⁴⁴ *Essai M.*, CLVI, 435.

⁴⁶ 6^{ème} lettre de Bailly à Voltaire.

⁴⁵ *Dict. philosophique*, Francs, 177.

⁴⁷ Lettre à Bailly, 1776.

alors que l'Afrique et le sud de l'Asie étaient encore brûlants.⁴⁸ L'argument le plus commun mis en avant par de Pauw⁴⁹ et Bailly est qu'un plateau fertile, refuge des peuples pendant les inondations, existait en Asie centrale, or on devait découvrir à sa place un désert entre les monts Altaï et Thibet; néanmoins cette théorie eut une certaine influence pernicieuse sur certaines branches des études scientifiques.⁵⁰

La critique que Voltaire adressait à Montesquieu au sujet des Tartares portait sur l'origine des institutions parlementaires. Montesquieu croyait la trouver chez les Germains. Cette conception lui fait donner un tour curieux à ce qu'il dit des Asiatiques. Il déclare dans un chapitre de *l'Esprit des Lois* qu'il intitule "état politique des peuples qui ne cultivent pas la terre," que les nomades jouissent d'une grande liberté et que si leur chef voulait la leur ôter ils se retireraient soit près d'un autre maître, soit dans les bois avec leurs familles.⁵¹ Il fait une curieuse exception pour les Tartares qui, selon lui, n'ont point de forêts donc point de refuge et sont à la merci du vainqueur par le fait même. Son but est de faire ressortir que si "les peuples du nord de l'Asie l'ont conquise en esclaves, les peuples du nord de l'Europe l'ont conquise en hommes libres,"⁵² les Tartares n'ont répandu que l'esclavage. Seuls trouvent grâce à ses yeux les Tartares mongols qui ont montré un talent de colonisateurs libéraux en accordant aux Chinois une large mesure d'autonomie dans les tribunaux et dans l'armée.⁵³ Voltaire n'admet pas la distinction de Montesquieu. Tous les nomades sont libres, ceux du nord au moins. Les Tartares jouissaient comme les autres d'assemblées législatives qui se réunissaient au printemps et celles-ci peuvent fort bien avoir eu une origine commune avec les champs de mars des Francs.⁵⁴

En somme Voltaire, comme ses contemporains, a ignoré le rôle civilisateur que Scythes et Tartares ont joué comme agents transmetteurs entre l'Asie et l'Europe. Les victoires de Gengis ont été dues selon lui non au remarquable service de liaison qui était le

⁴⁸ Buffon, *Époques*, éd. Picard, pp. 211-212.

⁴⁹ *Recherches philosophiques sur les Américains etc.*, 2 vols., Berlin.

⁵⁰ Vivien de Saint-Martin, *Hist. de la Géographie*, p. 535.

⁵¹ *Esprit des Lois*, liv. XVIII, ch. 14. ⁵² *Esprit des Lois*, liv. X, ch. 15.

⁵³ *Op. cit.*, liv. XVII, ch. 5.

⁵⁴ *Essai M.*, LX, 479-480.

sien,⁵⁵ mais à la force brutale et à la possession des meilleures mines de fer. Sitôt que ces "barbares" se mettent en route, ils paraissent aux gens du dix-huitième siècle voleurs, farouches, insupportables. Seul parmi eux peut-être Voltaire croit ou fait semblant de croire, que le monothéisme est né, puis s'est conservé parmi les nomades qui nous occupent. De plus il n'a pu se dégager ni de la tradition antique ni de la biblique. La tradition primitiviste antique, restée vivace au dix-huitième siècle en ce qui concerne les Scythes, subsiste largement chez lui bien qu'il l'ait souvent attaquée. Le portrait qu'il trace des Scythes et des Tartares est plus favorable que celui qu'ont laissé Buffon et Montesquieu. C'est cette tradition qui explique pourquoi il a représenté le Scythe supérieur à tout prendre au Tartare sauf peut-être au Mongol que son temps a vu avec bienveillance. Enfin il a connu les Scythes non seulement par les anciens mais grâce à des fouilles qui se firent sous Pierre le Grand, au cours desquelles on trouve des manuscrits, des bijoux non loin de la Caspienne, ce qui le porta à déclarer que les arts avaient "fait le tour de la terre" au moins une fois. Abul-Ghazi lui a même appris que la ville de Bocara portait un nom qui, en langue scythe, signifiait "savante,"⁵⁶ Voltaire a eu ainsi une lueur du degré de civilisation atteint par ces primitifs à l'aurore même de la civilisation grecque.

JEAN DAVID

University of Washington

LA MOTHE LE VAYER'S *VERTU DES PAYENS* AND EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY COSMOPOLITANISM

The cosmopolitanism of the eighteenth century was derived chiefly from the study of the literature of travel which had been steadily growing since the middle of the sixteenth. This literature came to the hand of the seventeenth-century sceptic who proceeded to use it as a potent weapon against the intellectual tyranny of the Church. A most important feature of cosmopolitanism is sinophilism since this branch of the movement brought to Europe the evidence of a pagan civilization of undoubted antiquity and of great richness. For the first time Greece and Rome had a worthy

⁵⁵ H. G. Wells, *Outline of History*.

⁵⁶ *Essai M.*, XL, 482.

rival. The sage Chinese appeared by the side of the virtuous pagan of classic antiquity and, in the eighteenth century, actually threatened to displace the latter. It was La Mothe le Vayer, in his *Vertu des Payens* (1642),¹ who first placed Confucius beside Plato and Socrates. He may be considered, therefore, as the chief precursor of eighteenth-century sinophilism.

If travel literature furnished the geographical basis of cosmopolitanism, the philosophical roots of the movement are to be found in the old controversy concerning the salvation of the virtuous pagan, which had troubled Christianity from the earliest days and acted as a disintegrating force that attacked the spiritual hegemony of the Church. It made little progress, however, until the evidence of political and economic geography came to its aid. The geographical and philosophical currents then united to create a definitely anti-christian movement. In the uniting of these two currents La Mothe le Vayer plays an important part.²

La Mothe le Vayer's book is a re-phrasing of a thesis developed by François Collius in 1622.³ The latter, however, had limited himself to the old sources of evidence, merely hinting that there was much in the new knowledge which might be brought to the support of his arguments. La Mothe le Vayer discusses in turn many of the virtuous pagans and attempts to pass judgment on their chances of eternal salvation. He "despairs" of the salva-

¹The work was one of the documents of the Jansenist controversy. Supposedly written at the instigation of Richelieu, it aroused serious opposition, notably that of Antoine Arnauld who replied to it in a work entitled: *De la Necessité de Foi en Jésus Christ* published posthumously, in 1701, on the occasion of the quarrel over Lecomte's *Mémoires sur la Chine*. That the *Vertu des Payens* continued to attract attention is evidenced by the fact that as late as 1674 Moréri, in his widely read *Dictionnaire*, cites La Mothe le Vayer, with Kircher and Trigault, as an authority for his article on Confucius. He uses the phrase "Socrate de la Chine" which, as far as I can discover, was first used by La Mothe le Vayer.

²La Mothe le Vayer's classical inspiration is Sextus Empiricus and chiefly the latter's tenth "trope" or mode of procedure for the suspension of judgment, which deals with the rules of conduct, habits, laws, legendary beliefs and dogmatic conceptions. La Mothe le Vayer's most significant work, the *Dialogues d'Orasius Tubero*, represents the very essence of cosmopolitanism.

³*De Animabus Paganorum*, Paris, 1622. For a discussion of the literature on this subject see: Louis Capéran, *Le Problème du Salut des Infidèles*, Paris, 1912.

tion of Diogenes, Zeno, Epicurus, Pyrrho and Julian the Apostate, but favors the chances of Plato, Socrates, Pythagoras, Seneca and, in addition, Confucius. It is in the addition of the last named to the list that our interest in the work lies.

Up to this time little attention had been given by scholars to the political and philosophical systems of the Far East. Montaigne barely mentions China. Rabelais's references are vague. Charron's discussion of the world's religions in *Les Trois Vérités*, apart from a brief reference to the Brahmins, does not include the Oriental cults. He says nothing of China, although, when he wrote, Mendoga's *Histoire du grand royaume de la Chine*, had already appeared. Mendoga's work was the first to throw any light on the obscure subject of Chinese religious and political thought. Nevertheless his account of Chinese cults is a jumble of ill-digested knowledge in which Confucian official, Tibetan lama, Hindoo dervish, and Buddhist bonze are hopelessly confused and the whole account is dominated by the old tradition of Saint Thomas, whereby that apostle is supposed to have evangelized the Orient and to have thus provided a Christian basis for its religious beliefs.⁴

La Mothe le Vayer's sources for the chapter on Confucius are (1) a small volume by the Jesuit father Borri concerning his labors in Cochin China⁵ and (2) Father Nicholas Trigault's *De Christiana Expeditione apud Sinas* . . . published in 1615 and appearing the following year in a French translation with the title: *Histoire de l'Expédition chrétienne au royaume de la Chine*. Trigault's work, based on manuscripts left by the famous missionary Matteo Ricci, contains the first important eulogy of Confucius to be found in European literature.⁶

⁴ The work was first published in Italian in Venice in 1578. The French translation appeared in 1588. As five editions appeared in France between 1588 and 1609 it will be seen that the work aroused much interest. Curiously enough I can find no evidence that La Mothe le Vayer used, or even knew, Mendoga's work, altho', in his *Dialogues*, he cites nearly all the important works on China which had appeared up to his time.

⁵ *Relation de la nouvelle mission des Pères de la Compagnie de Jésus au royaume de la Cochinchine, traduite de l'italien du Père Christofe Borri par le père Antoine de la Croix, Rennes, 1631.*

⁶ Trigault's work undoubtedly marks the beginning of a better knowledge of China. This is shown in the works of cosmography and geography which are later than 1616. One of the most widely read of these works, Pierre d'Avity's *Le Monde ou la description générale de ses quatre parties* . . . which gives a very clear account of the Chinese religious system, relies

This eulogy finds its echo in *Vertu des Payens*. Following his Jesuit source, La Mothe le Vayer exalts Chinese thought over even that of Greece and Rome:

... entre toutes les nations la leur est apparemment celle qui s'est laissée le mieux conduire à la lumière naturelle et qui a le moins erré au fait de la religion. Car chacun sait de quels prodiges les Grecs, les Romains et les Egyptiens remplirent autrefois leur culte divin. (*Vertu* [1642 ed.], p. 280.)

He then proceeds to develop briefly an enthusiastic picture of Chinese culture and thought. The following are the elements of this picture:

First, a country whose religious system is at heart monotheistic. All the complexity of Chinese religious thought, with its range from Buddhistic asceticism and nihilism on the one hand to the animism of the common people on the other, is reduced to a simple formula, the formula of the Jesuits: a belief in a Supreme Being, *T'ien*, together with certain "idolatrous" accretions, such as ancestor worship, the doctrine of metempsychosis, etc.

Second, the outward expression of this religion in an ethico-moral code which, excluding dogma, brings unity and harmony to the empire. Essentially this is nothing more than an expression of the Voltairian simplification that Natural Religion is, in reality, merely a system of morality.

Third, the imposition of these principles of religion and ethics on the system of government. Elsewhere La Mothe le Vayer, following Pomponazzi, Machiavelli and Hobbes, preaches the fundamental relationships between the government of a country and its religion.⁷ In China he finds a striking proof of this theory in that alliance of Confucianist ethics and absolute monarchy which the Jesuit writers so consistently portrayed in their writings. A hundred years before the sage of Ferney La Mothe le Vayer announces the essence of Voltairian sinophilism in the remark: "Il n'y a que les philosophes qui gouvernent la Chine."⁸ According to almost entirely on Trigault for its account of this phase of Chinese civilization.

⁷ John Owens, *Skeptics of the French Renaissance*, London, 1893.

⁸ Voltaire made considerable use of the works of La Mothe le Vayer. He uses the author's name in one of his pamphlets (*Idées de La Mothe le Vayer*, 1751). He praises the *Vertu des Payens* and the *Dialogues*, the latter for having fought with success "cette opinion qui nous sied si mal que notre morale vaut mieux que celle de l'antiquité" (*Œuvres*, ed. Moland, xiv, 87).

this theory China becomes the incarnation of rationalism in government.

Finally, a cult of pacificism bred by this spirit of rationalism. Trigault had explained at length how the tradition of learning in China had given the Confucianist scholar-official a position in the State far above that of the military leader. La Mothe le Vayer reaffirms this political virtue: "Ce n'est pas une petite gloire à Confucius d'avoir fait que la force obéisse à la raison." Seen against the background of mid-seventeenth century France, with its cult of military glory, the author's praise of Chinese pacifism is highly significant.

It is evident that La Mothe le Vayer is at times a little confused by the complexity and the contradictions in the evidence regarding Chinese thought but, on the whole, he accepts the Jesuit formula. The description given by him, then, is that of a great empire rich in culture, where the knowledge of a Supreme Being and a belief in the immortality of the Soul are the essence of a religious system, eclectic in its details; of a State government dominated by scholars who impose their wisdom on the monarch, softening the harshness of his absolutism and converting him into the benevolent despot of the Physiocrats; of a political system which exalts "philosophy" and of a social morality governed by reason.

After the middle of the century, when the *Vertu des Payens* appeared, works on China accumulate rapidly. These works all served to enrich Europe's knowledge of China and to furnish materials for the *philosophes*. In essentials, however, they add little more to the eighteenth-century picture of the great Oriental civilization than is to be found in La Mothe le Vayer's work. In *La Vertu des Payens* the author has already made the necessary connection between sinophilism and philosophical propaganda. He has already sketched in outline the "rêve chinois." It remained for later writers merely to bring the force of their polemic to its support. La Mothe le Vayer may, therefore, be looked upon as an important precursor of eighteenth century cosmopolitanism.

ARNOLD H. ROWBOTHAM

University of California

A NOTE ON AUGUST LEWALD

Ulrich Cruse's *August Lewald und seine zeitgeschichtliche Bedeutung*¹ is the only monograph devoted to an evaluation of the work of this journalist and writer. In preparing this study Cruse was, as he says himself, unable to find "trotz aller Bemühungen" two of Lewald's productions, the novel *Clarinette* (1863), and the "Epos" *Inigo. Aus dem Leben des heiligen Ignatius von Loyola* (1870). "Doch würden sie," Cruse believes, "das Bild des Konvertiten Lewald kaum beeinflussen, da es aus den übrigen hier besprochenen Werken jener Jahre schon deutlich genug herausstrahlt."² A copy of *Clarinette* in three volumes is in the possession of the Library of the University of Chicago whither it has found its way in the bulk of the Leipzig Lincke Leihbibliothek, purchased some time ago.

Lewald, it will be remembered, had become a Protestant at the time of the Prussian edict of 1811 which granted the Jews civil equality. But he seems to have been early inspired by Catholicism, and later his wife, a woman of orthodox Catholic belief, fostered in him this interest. It is her influence, and a serious illness which brought about his conversion to Catholicism in 1852, when he was sixty years old. At this time his literary activity ceased, until it was resumed with new vigor about 1862. Heretofore he had catered to the "world of elegance" but his new conviction had given him a different and more precise orientation; "so stellte er jetzt zum ersten Male seine Feder in den Dienst einer höheren Idee, der Idee der Grösse und Macht der Kirche."³ He now began to contribute to the propagandistic Catholic literature popular in those years preceding, and culminating in, the *Kulturkampf*.⁴ As the most conspicuous figures in this *Tendenzliteratur* appear the Countess Ida Hahn-Hahn⁵ and Konrad von Bolanden.⁶

Clarinette is the first major work of the Catholic Lewald. It is thoroughly imbued with the spirit of a fervent believer. Its main

¹ Breslau, 1933.

² Cruse, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 106.

⁴ Cf. Theobald Ziegler, *Die geistigen und sozialen Strömungen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*. Berlin, 1901.

⁵ Cf. Wilhelm Kosch, *Deutsches Literatur-Lexikon* (1927), cols. 749-750.

⁶ Pseudonym for Josef Eduard Konrad Bischoff. Cf. Wilhelm Kosch, *Das Katholische Deutschland* (1933), cols. 186-187.

characters and their tasks within the novel may be briefly described as follows. The heroine, Clarinette, daughter of very poor country people, withstands all temptations of life with the help of her Catholic faith and an almost impossible strength of character. She wins the heart of a count, becomes herself a countess, and saves her husband's moral integrity. Her sister, Agnes, becomes an actress and, as Madame Agnesi, moves about in a sinful world without having found salvation through "Demut" when we finally lose sight of her. Isidor, the unhappy young Jew whose father perishes in the gold fields of California, follows an inner urge, just as Lewald had done, and is converted to Catholicism. He sees the light first, oddly enough, at the Mission of Santa Barbara on the American West Coast, where he was seeking his fortune. From there he proceeds to Rome where he receives instruction and is soon received into the Carmelite Order. Of the minor characters in *Clarinette*, the Jews and the debilitated or unrefined members of an antiquated nobility are with few exceptions portrayed as bad. The narrative separates into several independent branches and the characters are then developed one by one. This causes the novel to be of loose construction. But Lewald's talent for realistic description of scenery, landscape, and interiors is apparent everywhere. We are surprised, however, to hear him say that east of San Francisco there rises "*ein eisiger Alpenkamm*," and that the chain of mountains barely visible on the eastern horizon are "*jene unnahbaren Felsenreviere der Rocky Mountains, welche der im Osten dieses Welttheils zuerst Angesiedelte lange für unübersteiglich hielt*."⁷ He is unaware of the existence and the nature of the Sierra Nevada, although this region had been explored by an assistant of Captain de Bonneville in 1833⁸ and by Captain John C. Fremont in 1843-44. The latter brought it to public attention by his report⁹ in which the Sierra Nevada is mentioned by name, almost twenty years before *Clarinette* went into print. Lewald's sources of information were obviously not as reliable as he believed them to be.¹⁰

⁷ *Clarinette* III, p. 1.

⁸ R. G. Thwaites, *Rocky Mountain Exploration*. New York, 1904.

⁹ Cf. John C. Fremont, *Report of the Exploring Expedition to the Rocky Mountains*. . . . Washington, Blair and Rives, 1845. P. 227.

¹⁰ "Was wir über das Land gelesen, und aus authentischen mündlichen Mittheilungen erfahren, von solchen die Jahre lang dort gelebt haben, sollte

Lewald's life-long interest in the theater appears again in this novel and finds colorful expression in the story of Agnes, whose fate is unravelled among many pages of description and critical contemplation of things theatrical. And quite in his old manner he gives free rein to the discussion of social problems, their causes and their remedies; they are, of course, viewed from the standpoint of the conservative and the believer. Julie von Bartel stands out as the free woman idolized by the *Jungdeutschen* of a generation ago. She calls to mind George Sand,—she smokes cigars. Several pages are devoted to the voicing of her opinions about the freedom of women. Yet, moved by the strength of Clarinette's humility and faith, she prevails on the latter's husband who is infatuated with her, to remain true to his wife. It is a variation of the theme: the good wins in the end. This expression of religious fervor and unshaken faith, absent from Lewald's production prior to 1852, is found here throughout the novel. Especially the account of Isidor's conversion is full of sincere emotion and is the most convincing episode in *Clarinette*. Lewald, who is by and large not very fortunate as a story teller and a poet, succeeds here in arousing the reader's warm sympathy. It may be said safely that Isidor's conversion had as source and model the author's own conversion since the latter says himself: "Wer eine ähnliche Bekehrung an sich erfahren, wird diese Schilderung von Isidors Seelenstimmung gewiss nicht ohne Rührung lesen, die in diesem Augenblicke auch denjenigen auf das Tiefste ergriffen hat, der es unternimmt mit schwachen Worten sie wieder zu geben. . . ." ¹¹

Had Cruse had access to the novel *Clarinette*, he would certainly not have failed to point out the significance of this work for it enhances, through its autobiographical incidents, our understanding of the convert Lewald.

Fritz Frauchiger

University of Chicago

uns dazu dienen, den Boden nicht unter den Füßen zu verlieren, und unsere Schritte darauf sicher zu lenken." *Clarinette* III, p. 2.

¹¹ *Clarinette* III, p. 55.

HIGH GERMAN VOWEL-QUANTITIES

In various publications¹ Professor Menzerath has advocated a triple quantitative classification of High German vowels into short, half-long, and long and the parallel differentiation of the diphthongs into half-long and long. These *phonemic* oppositions he takes to hold not only for the Rhineland, where they are a familiar phenomenon tied up with the syllabic intonation, but considers them "eine allgemein-deutsche Spracherscheinung."

The traditionally labelled "long" vowels and diphthongs of standard High German Professor Menzerath redefines into

- a. *half-long*, when they occur before voiced stops and spirants, before [ə], and before liquids of a following syllable.
- b. *long*, when they occur before voiceless stops and spirants and before liquids in the same syllable.

This durational distinction is accompanied by pitch and stress differences, the half-long vowel having a high-low intonation and a "staccato" accent which prevents its being lengthened at will in speech (*undehnbare*), the long vowel a mid-low intonation and a "legato" accent which allows the vowel to be lengthened.

A sound-duration investigation carried out last year at Hamburg University with three educated North-German speakers of the Received Standard: Z, R, M, respectively of Westphalia, Holstein, and Hamburg, produced lexical durations² for several pairs of words falling under the above categories. These words contain long vowels and diphthongs before voiced and voiceless intervocalic

¹ "Deutsche Vokalquantität und Dialektgeographie," *Teuthonista* v, 208-12 [on the vowels], "Beobachtungen zur deutschen Lautquantität," *Le Maître Phonétique* 1934, 68-73 [on the diphthongs], 88-93 [on the liquids]. See also *Beiheft zur Deutschen Lauttafel*, Bonn, 1926.

² To investigate this problem by recording sentences, as Professor Menzerath suggests (*Teuthonista*, v, 212), cannot guarantee that the differences observed between, say, *Meer* and *mehr* in the sentences *Da ist das Meer*, *Da ist noch mehr* (*ibid.*, 209) are not conditioned syntactically. If the articulation of a half-long or long vowel or diphthong depends on an historical, phonemic difference and not upon its position in the sentence, such a phonemic characteristic would normally be retained in its pronunciation as a lexical unit, just as *Kamm* and *kam* are pronounced with short and long vowel respectively in isolated pronunciation as well as in fluent speech.

stops. The following groups of measurements, expressed in hundredth-seconds, are based on two or three pronunciations of each word (with a preceding unaccented particle) by each of the three speakers:

	Z	R	M
[i:] biegen	13.3	12.0	13.5
bieten	11.3	9.0	8.5
[y:] Bügel	14.7	14.0	14.0
Güte	8.7	8.3	7.5
[e:] beben	14.3	18.0	15.5
geben	14.7	15.0	16.5
Degen	15.5	16.5	16.5
beten	11.7	11.3	14.0
[o:] Bogen	16.7	16.0	16.5
Boden	15.0	15.0	16.0
Boten	13.0	14.0	13.5
[ø:] Pöbel	13.3	16.3	17.5
Köder	15.3	15.0	17.5
pökeln	9.3	11.7	15.0
töten	10.3	12.3	13.0
[a:] Tage	16.3	16.3	19.0
Taten	12.3	13.7	14.7
[au] taugen	17.0	13.0	18.0
Taube	15.0	13.5	18.5
Pauken	10.0	10.0	13.0
[ɔɪ] beugen	22.0	18.5	22.0
deuten	13.0	11.0	15.5
Beutel	12.0	10.0	15.0

The evidence of these measurements is completely consistent in supporting the correlation: *long vowels and diphthongs are longer before voiced stops than before unvoiced*. In this the speech of these three High German speakers exhibits the lengthening of vowels before voiced stops found to obtain in almost all other idioms heretofore experimentally investigated.

A durational division of High German long vowels and diphthongs into half-long and long based on the exact converse of this correlation accordingly cannot be taken to hold for *all* speakers of the Received Standard.

HARRY A. ROSITZKE

University of Omaha

LENGUAGES DANS "PÈLERINAGE DE CHARLEMAGNE,"

V. 209

V. 207: Commencent [les Francs à Jérusalem] un mostier qui
'st de sainte Marie,

Li home de la terre la clament la Latine,
Car li language i vienent de trestote la vile;
Il i vendent lor palies, lor teiles et lor siries,
Coste, canele, peivre, altres bones espices
Et maintes bones herbes que jo ne vos sai dire.
Deus est encore el ciel qui'n vuelt faire justise.

Il s'agit de la fondation de l'église Sainte-Marie-Latine attribuée à Charlemagne. Je résume l'intention de ces vers en citant les mots de Morf, recensant dans *Rom.* XIII, 191 l'édition de Koschwitz:

Li home de la terre sont les Francs pour une grande partie . . . on peut supposer que le bruit du marché attendant à l'église de Sainte-Marie Latine contrastait aux yeux des pèlerins, venus pour prier, d'une manière désagréable avec la sainteté du lieu. Des marchandises barraient le chemin, les cris des vendeurs francs, juifs, arabes (des "languages" v. 209) pénétraient dans l'église et troublaient la dévotion des fidèles. Les pèlerins se plaignaient de ce qu'ils croyaient une profanation; il leur venait à l'esprit l'image du Christ chassant les marchands du Temple; ils en parlaient après leur retour dans leurs pays, et dans la suite naquit l'idée d'un marché ayant lieu dans l'église même, comme l'Évangile le représente.

M. Heinermann traduit de même, dans son étude récente sur le poème, *ZRPh.*, LVI, 535: "Leute der verschiedensten Sprachen" et comprend, comme avant lui Koschwitz, G. Paris et Morf, des marchands appartenant à des peuples différents.

Ce que je veux relever ici, c'est l'usage médiéval d'appeler en Orient *languages* les ressortissants de différentes nations. Je copie tout simplement le *Guide bleu* (Roumanie—Bulgarie—Turquie—Rhodes—Chypre) publié par la librairie Hachette en 1933, où on lit dans l'aperçu historique sur *l'Île de Rhodes*, p. 647:

Les chevaliers de Saint-Jean . . . étaient divisés en trois classes: les chevaliers militaires, les frères servants, les chapelains et en sept groupes ou 'langues': Provence, Auvergne, France, Italie, Espagne . . . Angleterre et Allemagne. Chaque 'langue' avait à sa tête un bailli ou 'pilier' . . . ; p. 652: les 'auberges' ou résidences de chaque 'langue' . . .

Ces *langues* répondaient donc à peu près aux *nations* de l'Université médiévale de Paris. On pourra donc rapprocher, je pense,

les *lenguages* de la Jérusalem de la vieille chanson et les *langues* de l'île de Rhodes médiévale et trouver, dans notre chanson, un écho du polyglottisme oriental et de la réaction française de ce temps. Il faudrait peut-être rendre l'ancienne expression d'une façon plus appropriée, non pas par "les gens parlant des langues étrangères"¹ (G. Paris, *Rom.* ix, 246, cf. aussi Heinermann), mais par "les groupes nationaux étrangers." *Sainte-Marie-Latine* est appelée ainsi, c'est-à-dire (je demande pardon de cette modernisation) 'Sainte-Marie l'Européenne² ou l'Internationale,' parce que (*car*, v. 209) des groupes nationaux différents viennent y vendre leurs marchandises.

Les philologues aimant la langue, produit et véhicule de civilisation, ne manqueront pas de se réjouir de l'importance donnée à la langue par la conception médiévale, à côté du "racisme" moderne suggéré par le mot *nation* (d'ailleurs, le mot *race* n'est pas "raciste" non plus, s'il remonte, comme j'ai essayé de démontrer naguère, à *ratio*, 'raison; façon d'être, espèce').

LEO SPITZER

The Johns Hopkins University

A NOTE FOR BACONIANS

It is well known that in a passage in *Troilus and Cressida* (ii, ii, 163-171) Aristotle is cited as authority for the contention that young men are unfit to hear moral philosophy, and that in the *Advancement of Learning* there occurs a similar citing of Aristotle to the same effect. Since Aristotle (*Ethica Nicomachea* i. 3) did not say that young men were unfit to hear moral philosophy but that they were unfit to hear political philosophy, students of Shakespeare and Bacon have acted on the principle well known to all readers of examinations, that a likeness in error is evidence of collusion of some sort. Baconians have reveled in the proof of a com-

¹ Ce transfert de sens serait d'ailleurs assez isolé en français, où un équivalent de l'espagnol *el lengua* est à peu près inconnu. Particulièrement le pluriel indiquant le groupe: les *lenguages* 'les gens parlant des langages' serait choquant. Et puis, *el lengua* se sert de la langue comme instrument, le *garde* a la fonction de 'garder'—le *lenguage* ne ferait que parler spontanément sa langue.

² Je suppose que le *car* élimine les Arabes, que mentionnait Morf: il s'agit d'Européens, d'étrangers non-palestiniens.

mon author for *Troilus* and the *Advancement of Learning*, while more orthodox Shakespearean scholars have accepted the evidence of Shakespeare's borrowing from a work published in 1605 when they attempt to fix the date of the composition or of the revision of *Troilus and Cressida*. It is, therefore, interesting to find the following passage in Nicholas Grimald's address to the reader prefixed to his translation of *Marcus Tullius Ciceroes thre bookes of duties* published in eight editions between 1553 and 1600 (I quote from the edition of 1556):

Now therefore, good reader, fare you well: and remember, how vnfyt (as Aristotle sayeth) and vnprofitable hearers of morall science yongmen be: as long as eyther they follow their youthly affections: or do continue vnskylfulle and rude in their deeds, that of dutie belonge to mannes life. For, all the whyle, they yeelede themselues to be led away of their mad moodes: if you talke to them of vertue, and of maners, ye do but sing the deaffe a song.

In the passage from Shakespeare the likeness of Hector's words to those of Grimald extends beyond the mistaken reference to moral philosophy to the comment on the deafness of the hearers:

Paris and Troilus, you have both said well;
And on the cause and question now in hand
Have gloz'd but superficially; not much
Unlike young men, whom Aristotle thought
Unfit to hear moral philosophy.
The reasons you allege do more conduce
To the hot passion of distemper'd blood
Than to make up a free determination
'Twixt right and wrong; for pleasure and revenge
Have ears more deaf than adders to the voice
Of any true decision.

Marion H. Addington, writing in *Notes and Queries* (CLXV, 116-118, "Shakespeare and Cicero") stated in a foot-note that Shakespeare "took over an error from the preface to 'Thre Bookes of Duties,'" and I presume that the reference may have been to this passage. But although Shakespeare's words are more like Grimald's than like Bacon's, I hesitate to accept such an inference. Bacon quoted in the *De Augmentis Scientiarum* (Bk. vii. chap. 3) from Aristotle the opinion: *Juvenes non esse idoneos Moralis Philosophiae auditores*. Spedding added to Ellis's comment on this passage that Virgilio Malvezzi, in his *Discorsi sopra Cornelio Tacito* of 1622 had made the same mistake (See Spedding's edition of

Bacon's *Philosophical Works*, 1857-8, I, 739, and III, 440). Sir Sidney Lee accepted the likeness between the passages in Bacon and in Shakespeare as the one good bit of evidence to be found in the list of parallel passages adduced by the Baconians, but he discounted its value and quoted similar interpretations of Aristotle from Erasmus onward, though he instanced none in English books. It seems to me likely that some Latin edition of Aristotle not yet noticed made the mistake upon which later errors are based, but if Shakespeare did borrow his reference from another English work, then it would seem that Grimald rather than Bacon was the source of his borrowing. And in that case, there is nothing to be learned about the date of *Troilus and Cressida* from this passage, nor is the identity of Bacon and Shakespeare in question.

LILY B. CAMPBELL

University of California at Los Angeles

AN EARLY REFERENCE TO LONGINUS

Although Longinus's treatise *On the Sublime* was first printed at Basle in 1554, it has been generally assumed that it was unknown in England until Langbaine brought out his edition at Oxford in 1636. However, the following quotation from a lecture on rhetoric delivered at Oxford by John Rainolds in 1573/4, which includes a translation of part of section XVII, 1 of *On the Sublime*, proves that Longinus's treatise was known in England more than sixty years before Langbaine published his edition.

Dionysius Longinus, Rhetor insignis, de sublimi dicendi genere verba faciens, sublimis orationis dignitatem figuris effoeminari, vel ea causa pronuntiat, quod figurarum illecebris qui iudices inescat: fraudis & fuci suspicionem parit. Vt primum quidem offendat homines sapientes, qui se illudi putant si tanquam inepti pueri, à curioso artifice, verborum exornationculis titillantur; deinde causam laedat apud imperitos, quod ut amoenae cautiunculae, auditorem à rebus abstrahunt, ad sonos alliciunt; sic quae compunetur [i. e. componuntur] exquisitius aculeorum affectum non inserunt auditori, sed concinnitatis.¹

¹ "Oratio 3. Post Festum Natalis Christi, 1573," printed in John Rainolds's *Orationes Duodecim* (London, 1619), pp. 327-8. My quotations are from the copy in the Huntington Library.

Rainolds, after elaborating this argument through several pages, concludes with a paraphrase of Longinus's final judgment on the subject: "Sic eam orationem esse putem florentissimam quae non est florida, & eas figuras esse maxime politas quae non sunt figuratae."²

WILLIAM RINGLER

Princeton University

SOME LINGUISTIC STUDIES OF 1935 AND 1936¹

During the period under survey our knowledge of the history of English place-names has been notably advanced by the publication of several studies. The most useful of these is Ekwall's *Concise Dictionary*.² This work is no digest, in spite of its title. Although the author has made full use of previous publications, he has also gone systematically to the primary sources, and has advanced a great many etymologies of his own, often for the first time. The book will therefore be of interest to the specialist, as well as to the general reader for whom it was designed. For the benefit of such readers a word of caution is in order. Ekwall makes no systematic attempt to distinguish between certain and uncertain etymologies. His usual procedure is to choose the etymology which he prefers and to set it down without qualification and without mention of alternatives. If he cannot make up his mind, he gives alternative possibilities, and occasionally he allows himself space for weasel words or even for a brief discussion, but want of qualification cannot safely be taken to mean that the etymology which he records is certain or even probable. Since Ekwall is a leading authority on English place-names, any etymology which he favors deserves the reader's respectful consideration, but it must never be forgotten that in this book the author is simply giving his opinions for what they are worth. Indeed, in the Preface he refers to his etymologies, modestly enough, as suggestions. His rather dogmatic

² *Ibid.*, p. 337. Compare *On the Sublime* XVII, 1.

¹ This survey is limited to books sent to *MLN.* for review.

² E. Ekwall, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names*, Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 1936. Pp. xlviii + 520. \$5.00.

method of presentation was of course due to limitations of space. Thus, if we compare his article on the Swere river with his earlier discussion in *English River-Names*, where his space was less limited, we see that the certainty of the *Concise* is not certainty at all, but only a choice among various possibilities. Let me add that in this case Ekwall's choice is not mine. Now and again I find myself sceptical of the etymologies set down in this work, but everywhere I recognize the author's mastery of the subject and his fertility of suggestion. Had he used his allotted space more cautiously, filling it with qualifications and alternatives instead of considered judgments, he must have still further reduced the already limited number of entries, and his book would have been far less useful, not only to the learned but also to the laity. One may be permitted to regret that the author, in his choice of forms, was guided chiefly by his interest in etymology, to the neglect of phonetic history. Thus, under *England*, the Chaucerian *Engelond* might have been given a place alongside the OE *Englaland*, since it shows the nature of the phonetic development (loss of *l* by dissimilation); space for this form could readily have been made by leaving out some of the later OE references. But no objections which might be raised should be allowed to obscure the inescapable final judgment that this is an admirable work, a landmark in the history of English place-name research, a book which puts us all deeply in the author's debt.

By way of complement to his *Dictionary*, Ekwall has published a volume of *Studies*, written for the learned world.⁸ Here he takes up in detail a number of problems in English place-name research. The work falls into nine parts: I, OE *stoc* in place-names; II, OE *gesell* and other words for 'shelter'; III, names of animals; IV, names of plants and trees; V, words meaning 'hill' and the like; VI, words referring to traps and the like; VII-IX, miscellany. Added are a list of abbreviations, a bibliography and an index. The monograph sheds light on many difficult matters. Under OE *sulig* (p. 59) might have been considered *Sulgrave* Np. The form *Okernebur* 1241 (p. 80) does not show that the first vowel was OE *ā*; we may have here the familiar contamination of *acorn* by *oak*. None of the forms of *Aconbury* show the *w* which

⁸ *Studies on English Place-Names* (Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademiens Handlingar, Del 42: 1), Stockholm, 1936, pp. 221.

Ekwall's etymology demands. There is no reason to speak of k-diminutives in either of the cases cited (pp. 86 and 91); in both examples the suffix is obviously not diminutive in meaning, and it would be sounder practice to speak of k-extensions. Under OE *hune* (p. 108) should be included *Arundel Sx.* The second *p* of *Hyppellesfleot* 1083 is probably a mistake for *wyn* (p. 121). I have noted misprints on pp. 77 and 192.

The volumes of the English Place-Name Society for 1935 and 1936 are devoted to Essex and Warwickshire respectively.⁴ They are both up to the mark set by the earlier volumes of the Society. In the following, I will comment briefly on a few details. Vol. XII (Essex): p. xxviii, besides the Scand. names referred to should be noted Hawkins (now Crawleys) in Harlow half-hundred; p. xxxvii top, *Roydon* is wrongly put under OE *ȝ*—the [oi] comes from ME [ui] and is by no means anomalous; p. xxxvii bottom, I am sceptical of the postulated sound-change -s > -sh. In *Wrabness* and *Russellhead* the el. *ness* has been confounded with *ersc* > *esh* (note particularly the first 1201 spelling of *Russellhead*), while in the other cases we have an ordinary spelling-pronunciation, as in *Parishall*, where the initial *h* of *hall* was taken with the final *s* of *Paris*; p. xxxviii, it is hardly right to call *n* a liquid, and the interchange and loss of *l, n, r* are too lightly attributed to AN influence, in view of the fact that such phenomena were "characteristic of the later Essex dialect"; p. 9, the spellings *Paunte* and *Pounte* are of interest for the history of the *au*-diphthong, as is also the spelling *Lowefare* on p. 62; pp. 31, 74, 83, 154, *Thrift* from *Frith* shows an interesting metathesis, to be compared with *Stilton* NRY; for the final *t* of *Thrift*, compare *graft* etc.; pp. 40, 180, 279, the prefixed *s* is perhaps a sandhi phenomenon, from *it's* or *that's*; in *Sturgeon's* the *s* may come from a prefixed *Cassus*; p. 45, the name *Meaca* occurs in *Widsith*, and is to be preferred to the hypothetical *Mæcca*; possibly *Meaca* himself or some namesake settled Matching—it seems clear that his tribe, the Myrgings, were Saxons; p. 47, *Bray's Grove* became *Bay's Grove* by a perfectly ordinary dissimilation, and it is wrong

⁴ P. H. Reaney, *The Place-Names of Essex*, pp. lxii + 698; J. E. B. Gover, A. Mawer and F. M. Stenton, in collaboration with F. T. S. Houghton, *The Place-Names of Warwickshire*, pp. li + 409. Cambridge, at the University Press; New York, the Macmillan Co.

to mark *Bay's* with a *sic*; similarly, the second *b* of *Bobingworth* (p. 52) became *d* or *v* by dissimilation; p. 51, *Quick* shows shift of stress (cf. p. 41 top); p. 53, for *Ealha* set *Ealhca*, with hypocoristic *-ca*; p. 66, the initial *d* (from *t*) of *Debden* is perhaps alliterative in origin; p. 69, the *v* (from *s*) of *Navestock* seems a clear case of dissimilation; the *k*-spelling occurs too late to have evidential value; p. 73, in *Folyat Hall* the (consonantal) *y* would be lost phonetically, and the first *l* might become *r* by dissimilation; the resulting *Forat* or *Foret* might then be taken for the familiar French *Forêt* and be respelt English fashion, whence the *Forest* of the present name; p. 133 f., derivation of *War-* from OE *wær* seems far-fetched; better *wearr* 'wart' if the topography permits; cf. *Wanstead*; p. 153, the *r* of *Plunker* is derivable, by dissimilation, from an earlier *n*; p. 158 f., the modern pron. of *Horndon* is not a reflection of "AN *t* for *th*" but of an assimilation familiar in Chaucer's *artou* for *art thou*, and the Elizabethan *art* 'art thou?' p. 177, the *a-* and *o-*forms of *Beckney* make unlikely the connexion with *Becca*; Ekwall *Dict.* suggests *beacon* as the first element; p. 179, I can see nothing "curious" in the development of the medial syllable of *Canewdon*—the *n* was lost by dissimilation, the *g* was rounded to *w* by the back vowel immediately following, and this vowel was reduced and finally lost by syncope; p. 183, *Burwood* means rather 'marsh belonging to the *burh*' than 'by the *burh*'; p. 208, OE *āled* means 'fire' rather than 'burned,' cf. ON *eldr*; p. 258 f., Ekwall has now given up his theory that *Ginges* etc. contain OE *gē* 'district'; p. 291, *Estre-* need not be comparative; p. 325, the *r* of *Alresford* may have come of a popular etymology by which the first element of the name was identified with OE *alor* 'alder'; p. 369, the river-name *Colne* may well be a back-formation; at any rate, the argument here advanced to the contrary proves nothing; p. 372, the long vowel in *berde* is presumably due to the familiar lengthening effect of the consonant combination *rd*; p. 395, the first element of *Langham* may be the same as the first element of *Lingfield* Sr; p. 403, the DB form of *Wivenhoe* is marked *sic*, for no reason that I can discover; it shows syncope of the unstressed vowel, but this syncope may be phonetic; p. 439, the title of Ekwall's *Studies* of 1931 is misquoted both here and on p. xlii; p. 485 top, the form *Eastuna* points to contamination with *east* and hence to an OE long vowel in the first element; p. 486 f.,

the forms with medial *sh* may have grown out of contamination of the second element with OE *sceolu* 'group,' here used in the pregnant sense 'grove'; a number of the etymologies in this volume want correction by Ekwall's *Dict.* and *Studies* of 1936: thus, on pp. 144 f., 171, 184, 187, 198, 216, 221, 238, 241, 259, 290 f., 407, 433, 504, 523, 535.

Vol. XIII (Warwickshire): p. 21 *Freasley*, Ekwall derives the first element from OE *fyr*s 'furze' (*Studies*, p. 116); p. 52 *Wishaw*, Ekwall *Dict.* gives a form *Wiðshada* 1166; p. 75 *Ansley*, the first element may be connected with OE *onwist* 'habitation'; p. 93 *Weddington*, perhaps 'wheat farm' or 'farm where divination was practiced'; p. 103 *Shelford*, ME *shere* 'clear' seems to have taken the place of its synonym *shire*; afterwards, *r* became *l* by dissimilation, and the vowel was shortened before the consonant combination; p. 106 bottom, *Mere* is to be derived from *gemære*, not *gemæne*; p. 107, Welsh *cors* originally meant 'reed,' cf. OIr *curchas* 'arundo' and Lat. *carex*; if we have before us the "old Celtic name for the river Swift" the stream must have been named in terms of the reeds by which its course was clogged; p. 110 *Tackford*, here and elsewhere AN influence is too readily assumed; the *t* probably arose in sandhi, after a stop or a voiceless spirant; thus, *at Thackford* would become *at Tackford* by strictly phonetic processes; we get like changes in Icelandic, where AN influence cannot be assumed; p. 114, OE *strudan* and OHG *strudgan* can hardly be cognate forms; p. 121, *Willey*, Ekwall *Dict.* explains this name, without qualification, as 'willow wood' while Gover, Mawer and Stenton with equal confidence give a wholly different explanation! p. 134 *Bascote*, the etymology here is based on one form alone, *Bachecota* 1174, but this form seems to be corrupt; certainly it does not agree with the other forms; p. 140, *Napton*, here again the etymology is based on a single form, and that the latest in date; for a different etymology, see Ekwall, *Studies* of 1936, p. 192; p. 159 *Coundon*, see Ekwall *ib.*, p. 198; p. 190 *Leek*, perhaps from OE *hlecc* 'leaky'; p. 198 f. *Bearley*, this name has not "undergone an entirely irregular phonological development"; the first element seems to have been the OE gen. *byrig*, whence the ME forms in *u*, *e* and *y*; the *e* was lengthened because the syllable was open, and this long vowel was spelt *ea* and *ee* in the modern period; p. 239 *Clopton*, *Shottery*, see Ekwall *ib.* pp. 137, 150; p. 243 *Forewood*, see Ekwall

ib. p. 76; p. 248 *Barford*, see Ekwall *ib.* p. 79; p. 266 *Wasperton*, p. 267 *Dassett* and p. 276 *Brailes*, see Ekwall *Dict.*; p. 286 *Wellesbourne*, the "early and persistent *Wel*-forms" may be gen. pl., or is "*Wel*-" a misprint for *Well*-?

Miss Serjeantson has given us a useful historical sketch of the foreign words in the English vocabulary.⁵ It differs from previous summary treatments of the subject chiefly in the matter of fulness. We have here a substantial book, packed with good stuff. The material is grouped in chapters, according to the date and source of the loan. Thus, we have a chapter on Latin words before the Norman Conquest, and Appendix A gives a full list of such words. In the appendix the words are classified by date of borrowing and by meaning; in the chapter, by document and author. The various chapters are written in an easy narrative, with much attention to chronology and details of transmission. The loans in Old and Middle English are analysed and documented with astonishing fulness; the loan-words of modern English are perforce given less detailed treatment. I have noted a few small points where the presentation might be improved. The OE poetical codices date from the end of the tenth century (p. 18). *Clerk* is not a French loan (p. 107; see Luick, p. 69); neither is *false* (p. 133). For *spook* (p. 179), see *Place-Name Soc.* XI, 272 f. The author cannot be blamed for following the *NED.*, but in so doing she heavily overweights the French loans at the expense of Latin. The 48-page word index makes it possible to use this book not only as a history but also as a dictionary. The same holds of Mr. Llewellyn's volume,⁶ a work not unlike Miss Serjeantson's, but restricted to a single foreign language, and hence with more room for details.

By way of preliminary to a dictionary of Old-Germanic names, Dr. Gutenbrunner has brought out a volume devoted to names of gods and goddesses.⁷ He confines himself even more narrowly,

⁵ Mary S. Serjeantson, *A History of Foreign Words in English*. Dutton: New York, 1936. Pp. x + 354.

⁶ E. C. Llewellyn, *The Influence of Low Dutch on the English Vocabulary* (Publications of the Philological Society XII), Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 1936. Pp. xii + 223. \$3.75. To be noted also is G. N. Clark's *The Dutch Influence on the English Vocabulary* (S. P. E. Tract No. XLIV), Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 1935. Pp. 14. \$0.60.

⁷ S. Gutenbrunner, *Die germ. Götternamen der antiken Inschriften*. Niemeyer, Halle, 1936. Pp. xii + 260.

indeed, since he takes up only the classical inscriptions. Within these limits he has done a thorough job, and has provided by far the best account which we have of the matter. I will comment briefly on a few details. *Eorþan modor* (p. 74) means 'earth-mother' rather than 'mother of the earth' (cf. *Beowulf* 2059); it is therefore better printed as one word. With *Sumaronius* (p. 79) compare further Icel. *Sumarliði*. Much's etymology of *Nehalennia* (pp. 81 f., 136) remains dubious, for want of evidence that intervocalic *hw* became *h* so early. The variation *-ena/-ana* is surely due to gradation, not to "weakening" of *a* to *e* (p. 83). The author in citing Irish words (as on p. 118) keeps the acute accent, but in citing Icelandic words he replaces it by a macron. In connexion with *Euthungi* (p. 145), *Eudoses* might have been mentioned, since the two names begin with the same element. In the discussion of Icel. *hamr* (p. 164), the author overlooks OE *hama*. The name *Chuchenehae* (p. 174) is perhaps to be connected with OE *Hugas*. I have noted misprints on pp. 78, 96 and 127. The index might be better.

The new monograph series, *Lund Studies in English*, is now in its fifth volume; it is edited by Prof. Eilert Ekwall. The fact that four of the five volumes come within the field of this survey gives some indication of the vigor with which linguistic studies are followed in Sweden.* Mr. Weman limits himself to 18 verbs, together with their compounds; these verbs he studies in detail, with attention to etymology as well as semantic history. Of special interest is his work on the interrelations of the verbs treated. His theory that "for a word to survive in language it must continue to perform a referential function performed by no other word" (p. 11) does not always hold in practice; if it did, synonyms could hardly maintain themselves. It must be granted, of course, that what the author calls "a competition between two or more synonymous expressions" often ends up in the victory of one of the competing words, that is to say, the loss of all the synonyms but one.

* Vol. I: B. Weman, *OE. Semantic Analysis and Theory, with special Reference to Verbs denoting Locomotion*, Lund, 1933, pp. 188. Vol. II: H. Bäck, *The Synonyms for "Child, Boy, Girl," in OE, an etymological-semasiological investigation*, Lund, 1934, pp. 273. Vol. III: *ME Surnames of Occupation, 1100-1350, with an excursus on Toponymical Surnames*, by G. Fransson, Lund, 1935, pp. 217. Vol. V: U. Ohlander, *Studies on Coordinate Expressions in ME*, Lund, 1936, pp. 214.

But this need not happen; thus, in *begin* and *commence* we have two English words which have competed with each other for some centuries, and as yet no end to the conflict is in sight. The author's discussion of the verbs in *ge-* is not altogether satisfactory; he would have profited by a reading of L. Bloomfield's paper in the *Klaeber Studies* (1929), pp. 79 ff. I have noted a misprint on p. 78. Mr. Bäck, like Mr. Weman, has made a thorough study of the semantic word-group which he chose for investigation. For a detailed examination of his method of attack, see my review in *English Studies* xvii (1935), 225 ff. Here it will be enough to say that, in spite of a certain tendency to reach conclusions contrary to the evidence, he has written a useful book; he provides evidence as well as conclusion, and thereby makes things convenient for the sceptic. In the discussion of OE *umbor* (p. 78), reference ought to have been made to R. Much's article "Ambrones" in Hoops's *Reallexikon*; see also my paper in *Namn och Bygd* xxii (1934), 43. Since the tribal name actually occurs with [umbr-] as well as [ambr-], the etymology which relates *umbor* to the tribal name would seem obviously better grounded than the etymology which the author favors. And what is the evidence that *umbor* was an *s*-stem? Mr. Fransson has examined records relating to ten English counties (Ess, Sx, Ha, So, Wo, St, La, Y, Li, Nf) for the period 1100-1350, and has studied the surnames denoting artisans and dealers that he found in these records; to some extent he has used records of other counties for purposes of comparison. In an excursus (pp. 190-208), he takes up two kinds of "toponymical" surnames: those in *-er* and those in *-man*. The volume is concluded with a list of compound surnames and an index of surnames. We have here a pioneer work in a rich and neglected field; it is to be hoped that this excellent study will lead to further work on the subject and that some day we may have a dictionary of English surnames, based on monographs such as Mr. Fransson's. Another neglected field of study is ME syntax, and here Mr. Ohlander has done good work. His monograph falls into two parts: (1) coordination by means of *and* instead of an exact expression of the logical relation, and (2) a symmetrical coordination. He has brought together a great mass of material and has worked out for it an acceptable system of classification. When however he speaks (p. 9) of "a comparatively undeveloped and

rough-hewn language like ME," I cannot follow him. Syntactically considered, ME is neither undeveloped nor rough-hewn. The peculiarities which the author ascribes to "a certain primitivism of expression" are in fact peculiarities of the colloquial style, and the dominance of this style in ME marks a healthy stage in the history of our tongue, a stage which we have no right to stigmatize as "primitive." The colloquial style has its drawbacks of course, but in this respect it does not differ from other styles.

Miss Stibbe's dissertation is a well ordered, clearly written study⁹ of an important and interesting group of words. Unluckily the author's conclusions are not always sound. Thus, it is true that Sarah and Isaac call Abraham *frea*, but it does not follow that *frea* means 'husband' or 'father' (pp. 3 f.). We must say rather that Abraham was the *frea* 'lord' of Sarah and Isaac by virtue of his headship of the family to which all three belonged. The article on *fæmne* (pp. 82 ff.) may be used to bring out more fully certain weaknesses in the author's method. The etymology of the word is disposed of with a reference to Holthausen's *Wörterbuch*. If we turn thither for enlightenment, we find that Holthausen simply repeats J. Schmidt's (very doubtful) etymology, without the slightest indication of its dubious character and with no hint that other etymologies have been suggested. As it happens, H. Pedersen has printed a full-length article on *fæmne* (in the *Grammatical Miscellany offered to Otto Jespersen*, 1930). Here the various possibilities are discussed in some detail, and a reference to this article was obviously called for, if the author did not choose to present the material herself. Under *meanings* Miss Stibbe rightly puts 'virgin' first. Her second meaning, 'nun,' is based on a single passage in which *fæmnena* (gen. pl.) translates *virginum*; obviously this does not justify setting up the meaning 'nun,' even though the virgins in question were nuns. Her third meaning, 'the Virgin (Mary),' is established by some (not all) of the examples she gives. Her fourth meaning, 'young married woman,' is based on a single passage (*Beowulf* 2034); in this passage, I think, the word in fact means 'virgin' (see *Anglia*

⁹ H. Stibbe, "*Herr*" und "*Frau*" und verwandte Begriffe in ihren alt-englischen Aequivalenten, *Anglistische Forschungen* LXXX, Carl Winter, Heidelberg, 1935. Pp. xvi + 105. RM 4.50.

LVII, 218 ff. and *MP.* XXVII, 257 ff.). Her fifth meaning is "Ehefrau oder 'Frau' im allgemeinen." In support of this meaning she brings forward several examples. I will take up each of them.

(1) *Hö* 49. In lines 44-49 of this poem we have a list of those destined to be freed from hell. Eight worthies of old are mentioned by name; others are referred to in more general terms: *monig modig eorl* 45. The rest of the men are taken care of in three groups: patriarchs (*heahfædra fela* 47), heroes (*hæleþa gemot* 47) and prophets (*witgena weorod* 48). The catalogue is evidently meant to be complete, and none of the items can properly be taken as mere repetitions (examples of the technic of variation). Next come the women. These fall into two groups: the righteous women of old in general (*wifmonna preat* 48), and the virgins in particular (*fela fæmnena* 49). Finally comes the common herd (*folces unrim* 49). That the virgins are singled out for special mention is only what one would expect, in a religious poem, and Miss Stibbe's effort to oust the virgins from the list is unconvincing; she overlooks the fact that it is a list, not a string of variations.

(2) *Hml. Th.* I 14, 24. Here we have a gloss: *virago*, *þæt* is *fæmne*. The *virago* in question is Eve, who has just been created and is without question *virgo intacta*. Moreover, as Miss Stibbe herself notes, a *virago*, properly speaking, was a particular kind of virgin. But the glossator goes on to do some etymologizing. He analyses *virago* into *vir* and *ago*. He equates *vir* with OE *wer* 'man' and *ago* he identifies with the familiar Latin verb, which he takes in the sense 'to plunder.' Eve therefore is called *virago* because she has been plundered or taken (in the shape of a rib) from Adam, her *vir* or man. Since Adam is called Eve's man in this etymological passage, Miss Stibbe concludes that *fæmne* here means 'wife,' not 'virgin.' She forgets two things: first, that *virago*, not *fæmne*, is the word under discussion in the passage, and secondly, that the etymologist neither said nor implied that *virago* meant 'wife.'

(3) *Af. El.* 30. Here Miss Stibbe is not sure what *fæmne* means; in such cases it is safer to use the ordinary meaning of the word.

(4) *Gen.* 884. Here Eve is the *fæmne*; she has just sinned by eating of the apple, but has as yet gone no further and is presumably still *virgo intacta*.

(5) *Gen.* 998. Here again is a reference to Eve at apple-time.

(6) *Gen.* 1722. Here the *fæmne* is Sarah, at the time of her marriage, when she was

presumably *virgo intacta*. (7) Gen. 2010. The precise meaning of *fæmne* in this passage cannot be determined with certainty. If *mægð* 2009 means 'people,' one may translate: "the people [of Sodom and Gomorrah], the virgins and the widows, deprived of friends, left [perforce] their place of shelter." No wives are mentioned, presumably because these had all been made widows by the enemy. (8) Gen. 2303. Here, as also in lines 2228 and 2264, the *fæmne* is Hagar, Abraham's concubine and Sarah's handmaiden. In line 2228 she is represented as *virgo intacta*, but in the other two passages she is not a virgin, and here *fæmne* presumably means 'maid' in the sense 'maidservant.' One may conclude that Miss Stibbe has not found a single clear case of the meanings 'Ehefrau' and 'Frau' for OE *fæmne*. See further *English Studies* xvii, 226 f.

Another volume in the same series is Mr. Fettig's study of ME adverbs of degree.¹⁰ The author has done a careful, competent piece of work. He has read many texts and has brought together much material, arranged in four periods: 1100-1250, 1250-1350, 1350-1400 and 1400-1470. He treats his adverbs in two groups: intensives and restrictives. In his "allgemeiner Teil" he traces the history of each group and sets forth its main characteristics; statistics of relative frequency in each of the four periods are duly provided. In his "spezieller Teil" he takes up each adverb in turn, giving the details which were perforce left out of the other Part. The scheme which he followed involved a good deal of repetition, but in spite of this the monograph reads well and must be reckoned successful. Occasionally the author's English might be improved; thus, in his translation of Lag. A 21610 (p. 167), *swiðe* is rendered 'much' instead of 'hard' (i. e. 'strongly'). The long *e* of ME *weel* is not properly called *gedehnt* (p. 185), since it goes back to OE *wēl*. The restrictive use of *most* survives, not only in modern English dialects (p. 200), but in American English generally.

Mr. Thorson has given us Part I of "an inquiry into the Scandinavian elements in the modern English dialects" (to quote the sub-title of his work).¹¹ Part II will deal with Lowland Scottish.

¹⁰ A. Fettig, *Die Gradadverbien im Mittlenglischen, Angl. Forsch.* lxxix, Carl Winter, Heidelberg, 1935. Pp. 8 + 222. RM 11.60.

¹¹ P. Thorson, *Anglo-Norse Studies*, Amsterdam, N. V. Swets en Zeitlinger, 1936. Pp. xii + 101. Gu. 2.80.

The Part now before us takes up the Scandinavian loan-words in Wright's dialect dictionary and in later vocabularies (those of Gepp, Green, Haigh, Mann and Pease). Most of the book (pp. 20-92) is devoted to three lists of loan-words: (a) provable, (b) probable and (c) uncertain. The first 19 pages give us introductory matter, statistics of the number and geographical distribution of the loans, "semantic implications," phonology and the like. There are also an index and a page of corrections and additions. The author has made a good job of it. He knows his way about in the scientific "literature" of his subject, and handles with competence much baffling material. His English in particular calls for commendation, although I must object to his loose use (p. 7) of the word *race*. His arguments against the derivation of OE *hold* from the Scandinavian (p. 8) are not convincing; a sound-shift $lð > ld$ is regular enough (see Bülbring, p. 187), and Old Norw. *hauldr* must be old, since according to Noreen the word always has that form in the records (*Gram.*, p. 96). The derivation of ME *bere* 'pillow-case' from ON *ver* is brilliant, but makes serious difficulties, which the author has not taken into account (p. 21). The hypothetical *pilwe-wer*, if subjected to dissimilatory processes, would surely lose its first *w*, not change its second *w* to *b*. Moreover, in OE we find a word *hleor-bera* or *-bere* 'cheek-cover' (*Beowulf* 304) from which ME *bere* can hardly be separated. See my paper in *Medium Ævum* II, 58 f. With *bleak* (p. 21) are to be compared *weak* and *steak*; cf. also *lake* (p. 35). I am sceptical of the Scand. origin of *choop* etc. (p. 23); if *she* comes (as it does) from OE *héo*, then *choop* or *shoop* is derivable from OE *héope*. The initial *t* of *choop* doubtless arose in sandhi. On *gleg* for *cleg* (p. 23), see *MLN.* XLVI, 4. The form *hawby* is not correctly explained (p. 32); ON *-úi* gave ME [ui], whence NE [$\Delta i > ai$], spelt *y*; this was reduced to [i] by lack of stress. On *lag* (p. 35) see R. J. Menner, *PQ.* x, 166 ff. ME *laif* (p. 35) may go back to OE *láf*; the *i* was a spelling-device to mark the *a* long. In connexion with *naist* (p. 37), NE *nasty* might have been mentioned. *Fay* (p. 60) may be from OE *fægan* 'paint.' The book swarms with misprints; I have noted two on the page of corrections!

Mr. Horwill's dictionary¹² is really a series of short essays; it

¹² H. W. Horwill, *A Dictionary of Modern American Usage*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1935. Pp. xii + 360. \$3.25.

is obviously modeled on Fowler's *Dict. of Mod. English Usage* (see *MLN.* XLII, 201 f.), but differs from that work in many ways. The author writes well, and his volume makes fascinating reading. He confines himself to words "common to the vocabularies of both England and the United States," and he is concerned to point out differences in usage between the two countries. He illustrates systematically by quotations from American newspapers, periodicals and books. His methods are sound, his tone is usually scientific enough, and his book will be of interest and value to British and Americans alike. I will note here a few matters that struck me as I read. The reference to the derivation of *acclimate* is misleading, and had better be struck out. *Admire* 'be pleased' is dial. in Amer. as in Eng. *Arctics* is now less used than *galoshes* in the sense given. Under *break* such expressions as 'give me a break' and 'he got all the breaks' ought to be included. *Check* vb. 'control, verify' is 17th cent. Eng. *Eleven* 'football team' should be listed. *Faze* vb. is surely Amer. nowadays, though formerly Eng. (*feeze* in *NED.*). *Gallery* 'verandah' should be added. *Impractical* in Amer. does not mean the same thing as *impracticable*. A *jaywalker* is one who crosses a street elsewhere than at an official crossing. Under *lay* the Amer. *lay of the land* ought to be mentioned. *Line* may be used as part of the name of a railway in Amer. *Locomotive* 'kind of college yell' would puzzle the Eng. and ought to be included. It is historically incorrect to say that *most* 'nearly' is an abbrev. of *almost*; in fact, *almost* is an expansion of *most* in this sense. *Rate* vb. 'deserve' is widely used in Amer.; it seems to be derived from nautical slang. The author is mistaken in saying that in Amer. "*rhetoric* has about it no taint of the disreputable." The pron. [raut] for *route* was formerly customary in Eng. and still lingers in milit. circles. To the *scratch* compounds add *scratch paper*. Under *shoot* the meaning 'speak up' might be mentioned. *Squad* does not mean *team*; the team is chosen from the members of the squad. Under *stock* might have been noted the fact that though an Amer. tradesman has a stock of goods he is not said to stock them but rather to keep them (in stock). In New York, *uptown* and *downtown* refer, not to the residence and business districts respectively, but to the northern and southern parts of the city. Similarly of the country as a whole: *up North* and *down South*. Under *turkey* one misses *talk turkey* 'get down to business.' *Uplift* need not "denote an elevat-

ing or inspiring influence." It is more often used in a disparaging sense. Under *velvet* should be included the meaning 'extra profit without extra effort.'

The dissertations of Mr. Friedrich and Mr. Süßkand are both ¹³ thoughtful pieces of work. Mr. Friedrich first defines his terms (at some length), then refutes with success the theories of Deutschbein, and finally advances his own theory: he links the intensive as an *aktionsart* with the circumflex tone on the auxiliaries *do* and *be*. This may be right, historically at least, but the author goes too far when he finds the same intensive in other verbal forms (p. 49). The *do so* forms (pp. 71 ff.) strike me as possible but doubtful. The cases of iterative *do* which he cites (pp. 43 f.) are actually only examples of emphatic *do*. He refers to writings of Kenyon, Royster and Hittmair on p. 50 and elsewhere, but does not list them in his bibliography. Mr. Süßkand, applying Behaghel's ideas to English, traces the history of the indefinite article from the earliest times to the middle of the thirteenth century. One must object to his monstrous term *neuangelsächsisch* for certain late copies of OE documents in which the copyists have occasionally been guilty of modernization. If these documents are to be given a special name, that name ought to be "modified Old English" or something of the kind. The author protests that his term must not be understood as a period term, but a period term it remains, nevertheless, in virtue of the *neu-* with which it begins. Mr. Süßkand has made a thorough study and analysis of his matter, and we await with interest the continuation which he has promised us.

Mr. Lehnert has studied to good purpose the *Grammatica Linguae Anglicanae* of John Wallis.¹⁴ His monograph follows conventional lines, but is done with thoroughness and accuracy. Unluckily he did not include the text of the grammar itself. Perhaps he intends to publish this separately. If so, one may hope that he makes the edition of 1699, rather than that of 1653, the basis of his text. Mr. Kenyon has brought out a revised edition

¹³ H. Friedrich, *Gibt es eine intensive Aktionsart im Neuenglischen?* [Försters] Beiträge zur engl. Philologie xxxi. Tauchnitz, Leipzig, 1936. Pp. 75. RM 3.50. P. Süßkand, *Geschichte des unbestimmten Artikels im Alt- und Frühmittelenglischen*. [Morsbachs] Studien zur engl. Philologie lxxxv. Niemeyer, Halle, 1935. Pp. x + 190. RM 7.

¹⁴ M. Lehnert, *Die Grammatik des englischen Sprachmeisters John Wallis (1616-1703)*. Priebatsch, Breslau, 1936. Pp. x + 156. RM 6.80.

of his well known handbook on American pronunciation.¹⁵ In his Preface he tells us that the present edition (the sixth) "has been entirely rewritten." The changes are chiefly of pedagogical interest; they serve to make the book handier for class-room use. I note with pleasure the author's admirable explanation of the articulation of the stops, earlier less well presented. My new reading of this book leaves me more convinced than ever that the *r*-sounds of English need no such elaborate notation as we find here. The one symbol [r] will suffice for *strest* and *unstrest*, vocalic and consonantal variants. Other objections, too, might be raised to this and that. But the author's mastery of the subject is evident, and his book is an excellent job.

Mr. Armour tells us in his Preface that his book¹⁶ was written "to meet the needs of those students who study the history of the English language as part of their English literature course." Of its 20 chapters, only nine deal directly with English; the other 11 are devoted to background material, chiefly Indo-European and Germanic. The author does not seem altogether at home in the subject, and his book, though pleasantly written and attractively printed, cannot be recommended. Sins of commission and omission are too many to be listed here. I will point out a few by way of illustration. The author lists (p. 25) the great Semitists of the past, but omits the greatest of them all, John Lightfoot. He tells us (p. 74) that "there now seems to be no doubt that the runes were inspired by the Greek alphabet." We learn (p. 141) that "the [English] people became bilingual" after the Norman Conquest. The English plural in *s* is derived from French (p. 143). It is a pity that the author did not get some specialist to read through his MS. before publication, if only to guard against howlers. Mr. Noyes's pamphlet likewise suffers from want of expert advice.¹⁷ The author is right enough in saying that "most of the etymological and semantic chains that have been proposed by philologists are highly speculative," but this peculiarity of etymological study makes it the worst possible field for an amateur like

¹⁵ J. S. Kenyon, *American Pronunciation*. George Wahr, Ann Arbor, 1935. Pp. xii + 248. \$1.50.

¹⁶ J. S. Armour, *The Genesis and Growth of English*. New York, Oxford Univ. Press, 1935. Pp. xii + 189. \$1.25.

¹⁷ C. R. Noyes, *Etymology of Early Legal Terminology*. New York, Longmans, 1936. Pp. 539-582 of "The Institution of Property."

Mr. Noyes. In collaboration with an Indo-Europeanist, the author might have brought his legal learning to bear on etymological problems to our advantage. As it is, he has achieved little.

The studies of Miss Schubiger and Mr. Saxe deal with certain aspects of British pronunciation.¹⁸ The former describes her work as a monograph, and expresses the hope that it "be a modest contribution to the science of language." In fact, however, it is only an elementary treatise, useful to teachers of English but hardly giving us anything not already known. It is well written and well organized. Mr. Saxe's study, in spite of its title, treats of Cockney pronunciation as reflected in two numbers of *Punch* (Oct. 4 and 11, 1856) and in certain writings of G. B. Shaw; his chief object is to determine to what extent Cockney speech changed during the second half of the nineteenth century. The book is carelessly written and the proof-reading leaves much to be desired. Thus, the list of abbreviations on p. 5 does not include three abbreviations used elsewhere on the same page, and one of the headings on p. 9 reads: "*Charivarian*" *Ortography*. The text is marred by many mistakes of many kinds. Thus, *shewgar* for *sugar* (p. 17) is given as an example of "quality unaffected by spelling juggleries." Such spellings as *saaints* probably reflect the Cockney diphthong, in spite of Mr. Saxe (p. 17). The spelling of *goloshes* (p. 18) is standard, and does not "contain a jocular allusion to *go*." *Scace* for *scarce* (p. 19) is an old form, not a "reformed spelling." The spelling *gurls* (p. 20) marks the vulgar pronunciation with velar rather than palatal [g], and *larf* etc. (p. 20) probably imply a vulgar pronunciation with retracted [a]. Likewise *maw*, *baw* for *more*, *bore* are meant to stigmatize as vulgar the pronunciation with the low vowel, looked down upon in the 1850's, though now general (p. 21). The spelling *ter-wards* for *towards* (p. 22) certainly "denotes stress on the latter syllable" but this stress was anything but "unobjectionable" in the 1850's. One might add indefinitely to this list of errors. This book ought not to have been published in its present state.

Mr. Brooks has studied with success a difficult subject,¹⁹ although

¹⁸ M. Schubiger, *The Role of Intonation in Spoken English*. Cambridge, Heffer, 1935. Pp. vi + 74. 6s. J. Saxe, *Bernard Shaw's Phonetics*, Copenhagen, Levin & Munksgaard, 1936. Pp. 86. Kr. 6.

¹⁹ C. Brooks, *The Relation of the Alabama-Georgia Dialect to the Provincial Dialects of Great Britain*. Baton Rouge, La. State Univ. Press, 1935. Pp. xii + 91.

he has not said the last word on it—has only made a beginning, indeed. His Georgia-Alabama dialect material is drawn almost wholly from L. W. Payne's "Word-List" and J. C. Harris's *Uncle Remus* stories. He compares this material with that brought together in Wright's *EDD* and *EDG* and in various other sources of information about British dialects, and concludes that the Georgia-Alabama dialect goes back largely to the southwest of England. The evidence which he brings forward is good, so far as it goes. Much more material needs to be collected and compared, however, if we are to come to definite conclusions. I add a few comments on sundry details. Under head 17 (p. 17), *ear* and *here* might have been considered. The vowel in *bring* etc. (p. 18), is [e:], or, better, [ei]. The form *tit* (p. 20) is no shortening, but goes back to OE *titt*. The spelling *faut* (p. 27) hardly means [faut]. The [u:] of *up* (p. 28) may be original. The forms listed under head 48 (p. 33) in some cases, at least, are explicable as having developed from a short or shortened *e* followed by *r* final. The statements about the Charlestonian *wh* on pp. 41 and 42 are contradictory. Against *here* (p. 43), the well known southern [hjæ] might have been mentioned, and compared with British [hjɜ:]. The palatalized *n* indicated by the spelling *gnyaw* (p. 44) presumably arose in the pret. *gnew*; the *y*-spellings in *dyar* etc. indicate a palatalized pronunciation of the consonant. A final *l* might develop in Scots (p. 46) by hypercorrectness, since it was often lost in that dialect. Under head 72 (p. 47), *barrel* shows no metathesis; *thash* is from *thrash*, not *thresh*; the loss of *r* in *shrimp* wants further study. The *m*-form of *rosin* may be compared with *vellum* (p. 48). I am at a loss to account for the author's statement (p. 62) that initial [h] "disappeared in the standard language toward the end of the eighteenth century." I have noted misprints on pp. 46 and 74.

During his last years the lamented Arnold Schröer was working on a new English-German dictionary, and thanks to the piety of Dr. P. L. Jaeger, who undertook the task of editing his master's *nachlass*, the dictionary has now begun to appear.²⁰ The first instalment gives every indication that the hand of the veteran lexicographer had not lost its cunning. Especially praiseworthy are

²⁰ M. M. A. Schröer, *Englisches Handwörterbuch*. Lieferung 1: A-Appertain. Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 1936. Pp. xvi + 64. RM 2.25.

the typographical devices which serve to classify the entries and to distinguish important from unimportant. Pronunciation is marked much as in the old Grieb-Schröer—a feature which some will regret, but others will welcome. I see no need of different symbols for the vowels of *law* and *war*; on the other hand, there ought to be a symbol for the old-fashioned pronunciation of “long o” before *r*, a pronunciation still widespread in America and elsewhere, though dying or dead in southern England. Schröer’s system of notation fails us also if we distinguish in pronunciation between *mayor* and *mare*. We could make shift, it is true, if his system were phonemic, but it is actually phonetic, as befits a work in which the niceties of pronunciation must be recorded. The system works well enough, however, for standard London English, and beyond this Schröer apparently had no wish to go. According to the title-page, the dictionary takes account of American speech, but this no doubt refers to meanings only. Proper names are systematically included—a valuable and welcome feature. All in all, if we may judge by the first instalment, this dictionary will do good service. During the period of this survey, only one new volume of the great Danish dictionary has come out.²¹ This volume, like its predecessors, is an ornament to linguistic scholarship and a worthy example of lexicographical work.

The second volume of the Kurath-Curme English grammar is now out.²² Vol. III, devoted to syntax, appeared in 1931 (see *MLN*. XLVI, 425 ff.). Vol. I has yet to appear. Mr. Curme is to be congratulated upon the completion of so substantial and useful a work, after so many years of study and research. In some ways the second volume is better than the third. Thus, the author takes a decidedly less hostile attitude to colloquial speech. His weakness in the phonetic department remains, however, and leads him now and then into difficulties. The pronunciation *ast* for *asked* is not only “heard in dialect” (p. 273) but may safely be called the normal pronunciation of the form. The *gots* of “I got good news” (p. 321) is explicable as a contracted form of *got us*, though of course the author’s explanation may be the right one; an unam-

²¹ *Ordbog over det danske Sprog*, XVI. Bind: Overgåa-Præsidium. Copenhagen, Gyldendal, 1936. Pp. 729.

²² G. O. Curme, *Parts of Speech and Accidence*. Boston, D. C. Heath, 1935. Pp. xvi + 370. \$3.50.

biguous example should have been given. Similarly, the *is* of "is you seed . . ." (p. 322) may be merely a weak variant of *has*. The explanation of *an't* (p. 248) is a distressing howler. The usual Southern contraction of *you all*, namely, *y'all*, is not mentioned (p. 152), while the unusual *you 'll* is made much of. The author does not always properly distinguish between literary and colloquial usage. When he calls *anywhere* etc. literary (p. 18), it is perhaps unreasonable to object, although these words are common in the colloquial style as well, but when he contrasts colloquial *don't* 3s. with literary *doesn't* (p. 252) he is surely misusing his terms; both these forms are colloquial, and the literary form is *does not*. I am more than sceptical of the colloquial character of the (to my feeling) formal phrase of *which* (p. 165); see *MLN.* XLVI, 430. I will comment briefly on a few more details. The illustration "the Germans are industrious" (p. 2) is unhappy, since here the article may be omitted without change of meaning. The quotation from Chaucer (p. 26) is inaccurately translated. The warning, "be careful to use *every* and *each* properly" (p. 52; cf. p. 67), is out of place in a scientific treatise. *Heartens* (p. 65) is wrongly included in a list of verbs formed from adjectives. In defining *accidence* as "the study of the inflection and order of words," the author has extended the meaning of this term beyond its proper limits. OE æ (p. 137) ought to be printed as a digraph, not as two letters. The author's remarks on ME (pp. 139 and 144) are highly misleading, not to say mistaken. I am sceptical of the explanation given for the gender of *ship* (p. 139). The idiomatic singular illustrated from Bryce and Mandeville (p. 163) is far older; see *Beowulf* 1407. The use of *modern* (p. 172, bottom) in the sense 'analytic' is loose and objectionable. It will not do to say that the so-called prop-word *one* is "an inflectional ending of the adjective" (p. 181). It is in fact a pronoun. Only *elder* is used (p. 186) to translate Greek *presbyter*. The word *Chinese* is both sg. and pl.; *Chinaman* has a derogatory sense (p. 194 f.). In such expressions as *I done tell* (p. 210), the *done* may mean 'finished' whence *done told* 'already told.' The author's treatment of aspect (pp. 232 ff.) might be criticized in various ways. The most serious weakness of the volume, however, grows out of the author's failure to distinguish sharply and systematically between morphology and syntax. Much of the present volume is

syntactical, and simply repeats what had already been said in Vol. III.

The volume by Messrs. Scott, Carr and Wilkinson²³ falls into two distinct parts. Part One, "Language," may be described as an introduction to general linguistics; of its 11 chapters, only one is devoted to English, although the illustrative material is largely English throughout. Part Two, "Word Formation in English," takes up first the more important prefixes and suffixes (classified as Latin, Greek and Germanic) and secondly a selected group of derivatives from Latin and Greek. A well-chosen bibliography is given on p. 378. The volume is well written and ought to prove useful. If a new edition ever comes out, however, a number of mistakes in the present edition might with profit be corrected. I will mention here a few out of many (all in Part One). P. 18, *Mittagsessen* could do without its first *s*. P. 36, the semantic history of *silly* is unsatisfactory. P. 38, *knight* first meant 'boy.' P. 42, *jail* goes back to OF and ME *jaiole*. Pp. 49, 67, 80, at this late date it is astonishing to find *Old English* used in the sense 'Middle English.' P. 53, *r* should be added to the list of syllabic consonants. Pp. 55 f., the authors contend that stops cannot be prolonged (a position to which their use of the term *continuant* commits them); they fail to mention the fact that long stops as well as short exist in many languages. P. 67, *opm* for *open* is not "careless speech" but normal speech. P. 68, *German* is here misused in the sense *Germanic*. P. 81, *-in* probably is as old as *-ing* (if not older); we therefore ought not to speak of substitution but rather of competition between two old forms. P. 82, it looks odd to see *a* described as a front vowel. P. 85, Irish dialect does not pronounce *feet* as *fate* and *see* as *say*. P. 87, the section on interchange of diphthongs had better be left out. P. 88, it is hardly right to say that "the accent of English words is so irregular that rules or general principles are of little importance." P. 89, it is not true that "in the oldest forms of English all nouns and adjectives and also verbs derived from nouns and adjectives had the accent on the first syllable." P. 99, here the authors treat OE *stáne* as an acc. form, though not on p. 96; again, on p. 100 they treat *stánas* as a gen. pl. P. 103, for *entirely* (line 11) substitute

²³ H. F. Scott, W. L. Carr and G. T. Wilkinson, *Language and its Growth*. Chicago, Scott Foresman, 1935. Pp. x + 389. \$2.00.

at all. P. 147, here and elsewhere the authors overestimate the influence of literature on language—a mistake which comes of interpreting the past in terms of the present. P. 167, the English language had no Celtic period. P. 169, *English* is not derivable from “an original form, *Angle-isc*.” P. 171, of the word-pairs here listed, only *shirt* / *skirt* hits the mark. It is not true that English “differs widely from the other Germanic languages in the extent to which it has discarded inflections.” Danish in some particulars has gone even further than English here.

Mr. Zipf's ambitious and important book ²⁴ may be described as a sketch, in somewhat popularized form, of the results obtained and obtainable by an application of the technic of quantitative measurements (or statistics) to the study of linguistic phenomena. The volume has as its sub-title “An Introduction to Dynamic Philology.” In a footnote (p. 6) the author tell us, “The term *Dynamic Philology* is preferable to *Dynamic Linguistics* because the former avoids the implication that our aims and methods are restricted to those reflected in the achievements of the latter.” In other words, Mr. Zipf insists on his independence of linguistics. Elsewhere (*Language* XIII, 69) he describes his kind of research as “the Galilean determination of the conditions which bring forth [linguistic] events” (by *conditions* he seems to mean cause; by *events*, effect), whereas linguistics is concerned with “the Aristotelian enumeration of characteristics of classification.” The distinction is real enough, but does not answer to any distinction between philology and linguistics. As a scientific discipline, philology is devoted to the determination and interpretation of literary texts (see my paper in the *English Journal*, coll. ed., xvii, 311 ff.). In popular usage, *philology* is practically equivalent to *etymology*. Everywhere the philologist is primarily concerned with meaning(s), and Mr. Zipf himself points out (p. 48) that “meaning or meanings do not lend themselves to quantitative measurement.” We are forced to conclude that in making his discipline a branch of philology he has made a mistake; *philology* is a name of maximum unsuitability for Mr. Zipf's activities, and it is to be hoped that he will exchange it for something better. His *dynamic* seems to have been inspired by Mr. R. S. Woodworth, the psychologist,

²⁴ G. K. Zipf, *The Psycho-Biology of Language*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1935. Pp. xii + 336. \$3.50.

who uses it in the same sense (i. e. with reference to cause and effect). This adjective, prefixed to the term *linguistics*, strikes me as meeting the need for a distinctive name, and the author was ill advised in rejecting this name. The views expressed in the present work are essentially the same as those set forth in his earlier work on relative frequency in language (for which see *MLN.* XLVIII, 394 f.), but his presentation of the material and the argument is greatly improved, and he makes out a more plausible case. The present volume is also broader in scope, and contains much new matter. In spite of Mr. Zipf's declaration of independence, this book belongs to the linguistic field and all linguists will do well to give it careful study. I add a few notes on sundry details. P. 34, the author is wrong about potatoes in the South. P. 53, the statement that the [k] of *call* falls between that of *keel* and that of *cool* is surely wrong. P. 56, bottom, the *t* of *stone* is often if not regularly aspirated. P. 66, footnote, I cannot accept the explanation given for long *a* in *exactus*; in all likelihood *gt* first became *gkt* and then *g* was lost with compensatory lengthening of *a*. P. 78, the statistics on Icelandic here mentioned seem to be worthless, as the statistician has taken the Icelandic acute accent as a sign of length! Pp. 92 f., the initial sounds in OE *cn-*, *gn-*, *wr-* were not lost, so far as I know, until modern times. P. 125, the sound-change *t > þ* can hardly be called abbreviatory. P. 169, *homo* is out of place here. P. 190, the *t* in *slept* is wrongly called a "complete morpheme." Pp. 226, 260, the presumption that the first human speech was "predominantly positional (and non-inflected)" is a speculation hoary with age but hardly justified. P. 231, *the* qualifies *house* only, unless *white house* be taken as one word. P. 239 footnote, the sense here given to *predicate* is not that of the grammar school teacher. P. 243, inversion is far older than the author supposes, and if it ever served to intensify it did so in prehistoric times. The author's English is not always idiomatic; see pp. 7, 32, 89, 108, 114, 144, 159, 160, 168, 190, 228.

I will conclude this survey with brief mention of two works in which linguistics is approached from the psychological side.²⁵ The two books are strikingly different. Father Reichling shows a

²⁵ A. Reichling, *Het Woord*, Berkhout, Nijmegen, 1935, pp. xii + 460, f. 4.90; A. F. Bentley, *Behavior, Knowledge, Fact*, Principia Press, Bloomington, Indiana, 1935, pp. xii + 391.

mastery of the "literature" of the subject and is evidently at home in linguistic science. His sub-title, "een studie omtrent de grondslag van taal en taalgebruik," gives at once his conclusion, namely, that the *word* is the basis of speech and the fundamental linguistic tool. It is pleasant to read his tribute to American linguistic scholarship (p. 349); unluckily he knew Bloomfield's *Language* in its first edition only. Mr. Bentley has much to say about linguistics, but seems unacquainted with it as a scientific discipline. His book has practically nothing to give to the student of language, whatever its value for workers in kindred disciplines.

KEMP MALONE

REVIEWS

Volkssprache und Wortschatz des Badischen Frankenlandes, dargestellt auf Grund der Mundart von Oberschefflenz VON EDWIN ROEDDER. The Modern Language Association of America, New York, N. Y., 1936 (General Series).

Spät, aber dafür umso schneller und sprunghafter hat sich die Mundartenforschung, die jüngste Tochter der Sprachforschung, entwickelt. Die Grundlage dazu bildeten die sogenannten Junggrammatiker, mit J. Winteler und F. Kauffmann an der Spitze. Dazu gesellte sich sehr bald Bremers 'Relative Chronologie.' Lesiak betonte die Unterabteilungen der Mundarten und verwies auf die vielen Zwischentöne. Wenker, Wrede, Frings und Maurer schufen sodann die Sprachgeographie. Die Wortgeographie und Kulturmorphologie der Gegenwart endlich wurden von der Bonner und Marburger Schule ins Leben gerufen und bemuttert. Wer also eine gediegene Arbeit auf dem Gebiete der Mundarten leisten will, muss vielen zeitgemässen Anforderungen genügen und von einer hohen Warte aus seine Betrachtungen anzustellen fähig sein. So nimmt es denn auch nicht wunder, dass Roedders Werk eine Sammelarbeit von Jahrzehnten darstellt und den stattlichen Umfang von 606 Seiten aufweisen kann, ja sogar muss. Dabei stellt dieser Band nur die sprachliche Seite des gesamten Werkes dar. Der geschichtliche und kulturelle Teil wurde in einem vorausgehenden Bande behandelt (*Das südwest-deutsche Reichsdorf in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart*, Lahr i. B. 1928). Das Buch behandelt die südfränkische Mundart des badischen Frankenlandes,

also das Gebiet zwischen Jagst, Main, Odenwald und Tauber, nahe der Scheidelinie zwischen dem ost- und rheinfränkischen Sprachgebiet. Mit ersterem stimmt es im Stände der Lautverschiebung, mit letzterem eher in den Vokalen überein. Das sprachliche Problem, das damit aufgerollt wird und das nur vom Gebiete sich kreuzender Sprachtendenzen her angegriffen werden könnte, ist, ob hier ein Penetrationsdialekt vorliegt, so wie dies in den letzten Jahrhunderten in manchen deutschen Sprachinseln in Jugoslawien der Fall ist.

Ein geschichtliches Kapitel "Grundsätzliches zur Mundartforschung" wird einleitend dem Buche vorausgestellt. Wer Sinn und Liebe für das Leben und Weben der deutschen Sprache hat, die ja aus den Mundarten neues Blut stetig zugeführt bekommt und deshalb im Gegensatz zu anderen Sprachen krafttrotzend und vollblütig in die Zukunft sieht, wer endlich in den Mundarten nicht allein die 'Milchkuh' für die Schriftsprache sieht, sondern sie als ureigene Verkörperung der heimatlichen Scholle betrachtet, der wird dem Verfasser für diesen Umriss der Entwicklung der Mundartforschung von Altmeister Schmeller bis zur Gegenwart dankbar sein. Mit beneidenswertem Optimismus, den zu teilen nicht jedem gegönnt sein wird, sieht er trotz feindlicher Schulsprache, Rundfunks und Lichtspieltheaters zuversichtlich in die Zukunft der Mundarten. Diese Zukunft wird wohl nicht zuletzt von der Einstellung der deutschen Landesregierungen zu Volkstum und Volkssprache bestimmt werden. Mit besonderer und berechtigter Schärfe wendet sich Roedder gegen die nicht nur lieblose, sondern auch stark anfechtbare Auffassung eines "Gesunkenen Kulturgutes," wie sie von den Naumann-Anhängern aus einer unrichtigen Auffassung mittelalterlicher Zustände heraus vorgebracht wurde. Es wäre nur zu wünschen dass diese kleine, aber gediegene Abhandlung als Einzeldruck der Allgemeinheit zugänglich gemacht werden könnte.

Nach einigen einführenden Kapiteln über frühe Besiedelung, Vermischung, Sprachtendenzen, Sprachvermischung und Sprachschichten bietet uns Roedder eine Lautlehre mit der üblichen, erprobten Einteilung (Artikulationsbasis, Akzente, Näseln (biogenetisch!), Vokale, Konsonanten usw.). Sehr reich ist die Wortlehre, die als besonderen Wert auch alle Gewinn-, Haus-, Hof-, Tauf- und Rufnamen enthält, die Verarbeitung der Fremdwörter behandelt, ja sogar das Apothekerlatein und das Mauscheln bespricht. Wenn man dann zu den ausgedehnten Kapiteln über die Diminutiva kommt, wird es einem erst recht bewusst, wie unendlich reich die Mundarten gegenüber der Hochsprache dastehen. Erst in der Mundart kann sich die deutsche Seele vollständig ausdrücken. Dies zeigt sich auch im folgenden Teil, der Wortfügung, die sehr ausführlich behandelt ist.

Von besonderem Werte sind die—Gott sei Dank—sehr zahlreichen Textproben, die alle in phonetischer Überschreibung wieder-

gegeben sind. Da haben wir die bekannten Wenkerschen Sätze, Proben aus den achtziger Jahren, Vergleiche der Mundart mit ungefähr zwanzig anderen Mundarten, ja sogar mittelhochdeutschen und niederdeutschen. Dass dazu ein feines Fingerspitzengefühl gehört, den Text in verändertem Lautstand, Wortgebrauch, Wortstellung und Satzbau aufs Neue zu schaffen, glaubt man gerne; nur ein Sohn dieser Mundart durfte sich dessen unterfangen.

Das Wörterbuch, allein schon ein lobenswertes Unternehmen mit Hinsicht auf das badische Wörterbuch, enthält in phonetischer Umschreibung fast 12000 Wörter und führt auch, *mirabile dictu*, die *verba pudenda* auf, die in den meisten Arbeiten aus falscher Scham oder Unkenntnis verschwiegen wurden. Man wird dem Verfasser auch dankbar sein müssen für die neue Art der Erfassung des Wortschatzes, die den Wortschatz nur mehr nach Wortgruppen behandelt, wobei also Tätigkeiten, wie Essen, Trinken, Schlafen usw. zusammenfassend behandelt werden.

Nicht unvermerkt soll es bleiben, dass Roedder, ein bekannter Bärenbeisser aller Fremdwörter, es fertig brachte ein Buch und noch dazu eine Grammatik von 600 Seiten zu schreiben, in der durchgehend das deutsche Wort gegenüber dem Fremdworte gebraucht wird. Man freut sich über treffende Verdeutschungen wie z. B. Zwielaute, Fliess- und Zitterlaute (sicher besser als Liquiden), Zeigefürwort, Wortfügung (Syntax), Selbstlautausfall (Synkope), Selbstlautabfall (Apokope), abgezogene Begriffe, Schatzhaus und Folge (Klasse), wenn ihm auch gelegentlich Konsonantismus und Vokalismus unterläuft.

Ausser einigen unbedeutenden Druckfehlern lässt sich über dieses Buch nichts Nachteiliges sagen. Es ist ein gründliches Werk, das den leider meist schwachbrüstigen Doktorarbeiten ähnlichen Stils in seinem gereiften Urteil und gediegenen Wissen als willkommenes Vorbild dienen muss. Roedders Buch muss seiner glücklichen Anlage und des reichen Materials wegen (welche Mundartbeschreibung behandelte bisher 12000 Wörter auf 600 Seiten?) als Muster deutscher Dialektbeschreibung gelten. Da Roedder dem amerikanischen Gelehrtenkreise angehört, dürfen wir in diesem Lande besonders stolz auf dieses Buch ein. Dank schulden wir nicht zuletzt der *Modern Language Association* für dieses erste Werk, das in edlem Wettbewerb die kontinentale deutsche Mundartforschung auf ihrem eignen Gebiete zu schlagen scheint. *Vivant sequentes et in Germania, et in 'terra Dei propria'!*

CARL SELMER

Hunter College, N. Y.

Gottfried Keller Bibliographie 1844-1934. Von CHARLES C. ZIPPERMANN. Mit einem Geleitwort von William Guild Howard. Einführung von Bayard Q. Morgan. Zürich, 1935. Pp. 227.

The Revision of C. F. Meyer's 'Novellen': An Interpretation of the Variants between the Texts of the 'Deutsche Rundschau' and of the Book. By RICHARD TRAVIS HARDAWAY. The University of Chicago Libraries, Chicago, 1936. Pp. iii, 77.

Women in the Life and Art of Conrad Ferdinand Meyer. By LENA F. DAHME. Columbia University Press, New York, 1936. Pp. viii, 420.

Zippermann's Keller bibliography is a welcome addition to those already at the disposal of the student of German literature, which now include, among recent authors, the one for Gerhart Hauptmann (up to 1921), that for Thomas Mann (up to 1925), and the beginnings of one for Rainer Maria Rilke. How long shall we be compelled to wait for that for Conrad Ferdinand Meyer? The first attempt at a Meyer bibliography in 1932 was so full of errors that it fortunately ceased to appear. Another was announced later but nothing has been heard since of its further progress. Is this undertaking also to be left to some scholar in this country?

The main value of such compilations lies in their preventing scholars, if they take the trouble to consult them, from announcing to the world with blare of trumpets discoveries which had already been made known some twenty years before. This has occurred twice recently in the case of Conrad Ferdinand Meyer. Let us hope that Mr. Zippermann's labors will make such things impossible for students of Gottfried Keller. The accuracy and completeness of his work can only be judged by Keller specialists.

Dr. Hardaway's purpose is to "present and interpret the variants between the text of Conrad Ferdinand Meyer's *Novellen* published in the *Deutsche Rundschau* and the final book version"—a theme bristling with difficulties for the non-German student, presupposing, as it does, a feeling for the language in the finest nuances of expression; including a thorough knowledge of Meyer's usage as exemplified throughout all his works; and, finally, lending itself to over-subjective interpretation. On the whole, one may say that the author has performed his task well because he has attacked the problem conservatively. No two individuals would agree as to the wisdom of his choice of examples.

The following points might be noted as to detail: "Kusterin" (p. 2) is a typically Swiss form. Meyer's remarks (p. 5) as to the haste with which *Die Hochzeit* was written, must be taken with a grain of salt and do not explain the many changes in the text

of that work. The comment (p. 6) on the coolness of Meyer's characters is, unsubstantiated, out of place in the context. Is "bigamously" (p. 8) the correct word when a marriage "non consummata est?" One can still find (p. 13) traces of dialect in the final version of Meyer's works; cf. the so often misunderstood passage in the *Amulett*: "eine fast schreckliche Weise," where the "fast" is clearly the Swiss usage for "sehr"; or "ennetbirgisch" in *Plautus*; and many others. "Briefchen" (p. 14) can hardly be called a Swiss diminutive. For the use of "zuhalten" cf. modern German "Zuhälter." Meyer's German readers considered this use of "zuhalten" for "zudenken" as incorrect German. "Ausweichen" may be found with the accusative elsewhere in Meyer. For the change (p. 16) of "weil" to "dass" cf. the passage (p. 35) where the change is not made. Punctuation (p. 26) in Meyer is a ticklish subject. As the author notes, it is difficult to state who was responsible for spelling and punctuation. At least, as the *Hutten* shows, such things did not worry Meyer much. The other changes on this page are not of much significance. The same statement is true of those on p. 28. The "passten" (p. 29) is no doubt the shortened form of "aufpassen." The whole subject of the simple for the compound verb in Meyer needs a special study. Cf. *Page*, "etwas gestossen" for "abgestossen," and many others. "Heute Nacht" (p. 32) is certainly not ambiguous in the context. The use of "bald" (p. 36) is common enough but would perhaps suit a conversational passage better. "Auf das Herz" (p. 37) is by all means the more common expression; cf. "Hand aufs Herz." Why is "garstige" more precise? The figurative use of "von" (p. 38) is more characteristic of Meyer than the "bei." The next change is a poor one and rather naively explained. Does one say in modern German: "Er sass da in Nachthemd" or "im Nachthemd?" Was the exclamation mark (p. 48) Meyer's own? Is "vor dem anderen" (p. 51) an adverbial or a plain prepositional phrase after "sich zieren?" Is the "doch" (p. 53) of the first passage less of an adverbial particle than that of the second? For p. 54 see comment on p. 29. This colloquial, almost slangy, use of "noble" (p. 58) suits the humble peasant girl better than the more bookish "gütig." The foreign element played no rôle. Meyer must have felt the slangy element. What could be more prosaic with regard to eating than "genoss" (p. 61)? It may be, of course, that the word in Meyer's day had not degenerated to its present colloquial usage; cf. "Das Fleisch ist nicht zu geniessen." One of Meyer's contemporary German critics considered "nahm Speise" as more French than German. In the first passage (p. 63) it is not a matter of the future meaning of "beneiden," but rather an intensification of expression: "We'll see to it that other cities envy us." Since when has "anerboren" been in good usage? It is probably a hybrid form from "anerezogen." "Angeboren" and "anerezogen" are so often used together

that the new form was readily coined. It looks like Meyer's own, just as his "Beihälterin" in the *Page* is a hybrid formation from "Beischläferin" and "Zuhälterin." The author might also have given us some examples of Meyer's peculiar expressions for the unreal and ideal conditional, which he sometimes changed to bring them closer to the normal usage. It should be especially mentioned that some of the changes noted do not appear in the first book editions. Finally, did sentence rhythm, that most important element in any such study as this, play no rôle in Meyer's revisions? Numerous misprints have been noted, which are at the author's disposal if desired.

After two careful readings of Dr. Dahme's book this reviewer has been compelled to come to the conclusion that it is but the "reductio ad absurdum" of that type of literary study and criticism which denies to an author all power of imagination and all creative art and insists upon identifying each and every one of his characters with some individual, regardless of how obscure and unimportant he or she may have been, whom the author had known in his lifetime. We enter "das Reich des Unausführbaren und Schimärischen" and finally arrive at all sorts of improbabilities, impossibilities, and absurdities.

One brief example will suffice to show the fundamental basis upon which the whole book has been constructed. In *Die Richter* Wulfrin comes to Malmort at Stemma's summons and finds there his supposed sister, Palma novella, with whom he presently falls passionately in love. The younger individual, Palma, entertains the same feelings for him, although in her youth and innocence she is not as aware as he of their true nature. Out of this perfectly logical and quite natural situation, which may even be called hackneyed and which also did not require the art of Meyer to formulate, Dr. Dahme deduces the fact that such a relationship existed between Meyer and his sister. Emmel had already claimed this unprovable discovery as part of "das deutsche Antlitz" of Meyer. Dr. Dahme's reasoning, which she considers far superior to that of Emmel, is characteristic of the school of which she is an adherent: "The very fact that Meyer found it appropriate to portray this eroticism proves conclusively (!) enough that it was grounded in personal experience." All ye who have treated this theme, from Ovid to Frank Thiess, arise and defend yourselves! Frau Stemma inherited her conscience from Frau Betsy, although we doubt whether the latter would have been flattered by the comparison. "The conflict in Frau Stemma's agonized soul is a portrayal of Frau Betsy's mental state at that time, when nerve-shattered and distraught, she branded herself as the murderess of Mallet, a great sinner, and beyond all heavenly mercy." Even her mother love Stemma must borrow from Frau Betsy. Mathilde Escher furnishes her with her administrative abilities; Helene

Druskowitz, with her statuesque presence. That charming creature, Palma novella, is a "ragout" of Betsy, Meyer's sister, from whom is derived her love for her brother, and Johanna Spyri, from whom comes her love of the mountains and the outdoor life. And then the final shiver: "The life of Frau Stemma and her secret is Meyer's poetic treatment of Caroline Bauer's long misery on her villa Broelberg." That notorious individual, of whom we know that Meyer considered her a great liar, also had to come to his help for the portrayal of those simple characters, Gustel and Corinna, of the *Page*. Such, then, is the final dissolution of a story which we had always considered among Meyer's greatest, being surpassed only by *Der Heilige* and *Pescara*.

It will be noted in the quotations given above that the author leaves no room for debate or discussion. Her conclusions are announced with the finality of inspiration. Predecessors are swept aside with a graceful gesture. Here we really find the last word to be said on the subject.

One scarcely trusts one's eyes when one reads that Meyer's greatest creation, *Der Heilige*, is based upon the life of an obscure Swiss clergyman, whom the author has resurrected for us in order to prove the consistency of her theories. That individual left the State for the Church, and had a daughter who died young. *Ergo*, here is the model for Thomas à Becket. Poor Schadau cannot visit Gasparde at Chatillon's house and join in the family meal without Meyer having sat at Vulliemin's table with Alexandrine Marquis. Another *ergo*. Alexandrine is Gasparde, or is it the other way round?

In her passionate defense of Meyer's mother (it reads as if based upon personal experience), the author characteristically states: "The verdict of condemnation pronounced by Meyer's critics on Frau Betsy's motherhood is the result of a superficial or fragmentary consideration of these interrelated factors" (family history and environment). And this in spite of Lusser's detailed and conclusive study! By what processes of logical reasoning it can be deduced from the evidence at hand that Frau Betsy and her son "found each other," is beyond our comprehension. "The stigma of a seven months' stay in an asylum" was due to Frau Betsy's lamentations among her friends and Meyer's bitterness on this score can be readily understood, although the author twists the evidence in favor of his mother and against Meyer himself. Frau Betsy was a pathological nature from the death of her husband on and was much more interested in saving her son's soul than in providing for his future. In fact, for her the two concepts coincided. Lack of space forbids a more detailed discussion of this subject, but we may add that Dr. Dahme has offered nothing to invalidate Lusser's conclusion that "Meyers Mutter ein Haupthindernis zur Künstlerschaft des Sohnes bildete."

In conclusion, the author has given a series of interesting pen

pictures of the women with whom Meyer was more or less acquainted, although practically nothing new has been added to our knowledge of the more prominent ones among them. Her vivid imagination—a quality which she denies to Meyer himself—has led her into picturing Conrad Ferdinand as a more ardent lover than we ever had imagined him to be. Clelia Weydmann was no doubt the “grande passion” of his life and the only one. And yet the author knows that *Sehnsucht ist Qual* refers to Alexandrine Marquis and that Meyer had “suffered torments of soul due to his infatuation” for her. A saving sense of humor prevents her from following Frau Betsy and most of Meyer’s critics in taking the jovial affair with Constance von Rodt seriously. Caroline Bauer and Helene Druskowitz played but very minor rôles in Meyer’s life. The former, for whom he had little respect, chanced to be his neighbor. His relations with the latter were based upon his friendship with Louise von François and his weakness in not being able to say “No” when asked to do a favor. They “undoubtedly and conclusively” played no part in his life as a literary artist.

ROBERT BRUCE ROULSTON

The Johns Hopkins University

The Tyranny of Greece over Germany, a study of the influence exercised by Greek art and poetry over the great German writers of the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries. By E. M. BUTLER, Cambridge, at the University Press, 1935. Pp. xi + 351. 15s.

Miss Butler intends to prove that Greek art, interpreted by Winckelmann as the expression of noble simplicity and serene greatness and established by him as the pattern of every art, was fatal for the life and works of Goethe, Schiller and Hölderlin (p. 7). Winckelmann’s dogma, attacked by Lessing and altered by Herder, was eventually overcome by Heine who was the first to recognize the tragic element in Greek paganism; “by exploding the mine of relativity he razed Mount Olympus to the ground” (p. 299). This conception of a tragic and consequently of a Dionysiac moment as significant for the Greeks was destructive to later German literature and thinking, in Nietzsche and George, as is briefly shown in the last chapter of the book.

Wherein consists the destruction brought about by the Greek example? Miss Butler contends that there is an annihilation of creative power by it: “Goethe . . . could have achieved a more signal triumph, had he given the reins to his creative genius and trusted it entirely” (p. 87), had he not, in following the dogma of

Winckelmann and fighting against himself, "misplaced his heroism" (p. 90). I do not see the value of such considerations. I entirely agree with Miss Butler's general statement which, however, is not taken into account in her detailed study that "idly one wonders what other and perhaps greater works the German genius might have produced had it never been deflected from its natural course by the magnetic south" (p. 334). This, no one can tell. Yet for Miss Butler the essential dilemma in the case for and against German Hellenism is whether one "would be willing to sacrifice Hölderlin's poems and his Empedocles for the unknown children of Goethe's native genius who never saw the light of day," and this dilemma is incapable of solution (p. 334). I cannot argue either about Miss Butler's assumption that Schiller "had solved the problem of guilt and fate at last"; that "the completion of this tragedy (Demetrius) would have placed him upon the pinnacle of his dreams. But it was not to be. Fate allowed him to go thus far and no farther. He was guilty of the sin of *hybris* in setting himself up against the Greeks" (p. 199/200). I am not prepared to decide whether Schiller's death was a penalty to be paid for his contest with the Greeks. Finally Miss Butler states: "The immediate cause or the first symptom of Hölderlin's collapse was, I believe, the command he received at the eleventh hour to transfer his allegiance from the Gods of Greece returning in all their ancient glory to the son of man called Christ" (p. 238). This, again, I do not dare to decide.

Even if these judgments were true and adequate, wherein lies the responsibility of the Greeks, or rather of the impostors Winckelmann established as kings (p. 48)? "One murder, one sudden death, two cases of insanity, another of megalomania; and the insidious disease of mythomania undermining nearly all; it is enough to make the merciful regret that Winckelmann was ever born" (p. 336). Certainly, if one opposes the belief that personal tragedies are justified transcendently because they resulted in great art (p. 336). But the Greeks may be tyrants and the Germans predestined slaves (p. 6)—in what way did Winckelmann's dogma enforce its acceptance? Miss Butler seems inclined to agree with Heine's statement that "it is not we who seize upon an Idea; the Idea seizes us, and enslaves us and whips us into the arena, so that we are forced to fight for it, like the gladiator of old" (p. 244). This, I believe, does not fit Schiller, who defined man as the being endowed with will. It is hard to imagine Goethe seized by an Idea. Hölderlin, as Miss Butler herself points out (p. 214, 216), eagerly guarded his freedom against Schiller and Greek literature. The relation of all these men to the Greeks can not even be understood as that of imitation. Kant, whose influence on German poetry Miss Butler so bitterly deprecates (p. 158), seems to be more correct:

Das Product eines Genies (nach demjenigen, was in demselben dem Genie, nicht der möglichen Erlernung oder der Schule, zuzuschreiben ist) ist ein Beispiel nicht der Nachahmung (denn da würde das, was daran Genie ist und den Geist des Werkes ausmacht, wegfallen), sondern der Nachfolge für ein anderes Genie, welches dadurch zum Gefühl seiner eigenen Originalität aufgeweckt wird (*Kritik der Urteilkraft, Kritik der ästhetischen Urteilkraft*, 49 finis).

Thus the German genius, in voluntary emulation of the Greek example, freed itself. The fact being as is assumed by Miss Butler that "the great German Hellenists have left behind them incomparable poetry and fascinating prose," it is almost meaningless to call their works "the literary by-products of a tragic obsession" (p. 336).

Moreover, there is a strange inconsistency in Miss Butler's statements. She has an absolute standard of judging artistic works which, as such, I do not want to reject. But if it is true that "to accomplish really significant feats a man needs integrity of character" which Winckelmann does not possess (p. 16), she should not admit that his conceptions of art "as an organic growth, inseparable from racial, climatic, social and political conditions, is one of the permanent achievements of the human mind" (p. 44). If beauty and harmony alone cannot produce poetry (p. 127/8) and if a sense for tragedy is essential to a poet—an experience Goethe resisted (p. 90) and in doing so failed in his creative power (p. 91)—she should deny that Goethe was a poet, and not claim that from his defeats he wrested victories "no other mind could have achieved" (p. 91). These are contradictory statements; each refutes the other.

Miss Butler is aware of many things she does not properly evaluate for her thesis. In the discussion of Schiller's life, she remarks that "one side of Goethe's nature was after all in fundamental sympathy with the clarity, serenity and simplicity of Greek art" (p. 200); she does not take this into consideration in her analysis of Goethe. As it seems to me, her predilection for dramatic effects blinds her to the significance of the data; this liking of hers goes so far as to impute to Lessing, the most veracious of men, that he falsified facts to make Laocoon a drama (p. 58/9). Yet she acknowledges that "impartiality can hardly be too great in an academic thesis," even if it is "a very doubtful blessing in a dramatic work of art" (p. 60).

The theme of Miss Butler is very restricted. The influence of the Greeks on European thought should be discussed in a much broader context in order to reach a real solution as she herself indicates (p. 6/7). In such an inquiry, it could also be proved that it was not Heine who gave the new interpretation of the Greek ideal. Heine himself ascribed the process of destruction to the German "Naturphilosophie" beginning with Kant and ending with Hegel, the greatest philosopher since Leibniz, the founder of

the system of indifferentism; this dogma together with the revival of paganism he called the great menace to the future (*Zur Geschichte der Religion und Philosophie in Deutschland*, III finis; II finis). Heine was the propagator of ideas which other men established.

Miss Butler, I believe, is not convincing in spite of all the high qualities which distinguish her book. I was fascinated by her passionate concern for her subject, by her vivid and suggestive language, most impressive in her translations of German poetry into English verse that retain the charm and the individuality of the originals. I admired her masterly knowledge of German literature, her sincere endeavor not only to describe but also to interpret the phenomena. At the same time, I found myself constantly in revolt against her methods of judgment and I felt utterly at variance with the results of her analysis.

LUDWIG EDELSTEIN

The Johns Hopkins University

Germany in the Eighteenth Century: The Social Background of the Literary Revival. By W. H. BRUFORD. (Cambridge. At the University Press, 1935.) Die deutsche Übertragung erschien unter dem Titel: "*Die gesellschaftlichen Grundlagen der Goethezeit*" im Verlag Hermann Böhlaus Nachf./Weimar, 1936.

W. H. Bruford, der Germanist der Universität Edinburgh, hat in seiner Arbeit versucht, die politischen und wirtschaftlichen Bedingungen darzustellen, unter denen die Menschen in Deutschland im 18. Jahrhundert lebten, um dem englischen und amerikanischen Studenten die sozialen Grundlagen der deutschen Literatur in dieser grossen Epoche verständlich zu machen. Lebendig rollt er die Kulturgeschichte eines Jahrhunderts, Rückschau haltend bis in das späte Mittelalter, vor unsern Augen ab. Bruford gibt ein Bild der deutschen Kleinstaatserei und des Wesens des aufgeklärten Absolutismus in Deutschland, er schildert die alte Gesellschaftsordnung des Adels und der Bauern und die neue der Bürger, er malt in bunten Farben das Leben an den Höfen und die Entwicklung der Städte, er zeichnet die rechtlichen und wirtschaftlichen Grundlagen von Landwirtschaft, Handel und Gewerbe, die Probleme der Erziehung des Bürgers und der gesellschaftlichen Stellung der freien Berufe, vor allem des Schriftstellers. Eine allzu kurze Darstellung des Einflusses dieser politischen, sozialen und wirtschaftlichen Bedingungen auf die Literatur der Zeit schliesst das fleissige, sorgfältig gearbeitete Buch ab.

Man muss sich bei der Würdigung der Arbeit ihrer Absicht bewusst bleiben: sie ist nicht das Werk eines Historikers, der auf eigenen Forschungen ein eigenes Bild einer vergangenen Zeit, einer lebendigen Welt aufbauen will, wie sie dem "guten Europäer" im Jahre des Heils 1937 erscheint. Bruford fusst, wie er selbst betont, zum grossen Teil auf den Ergebnissen deutscher Forschung, er bleibt immer der Literarhistoriker, der sich in seinen "Nebestunden" bemüht, aus den kulturgeschichtlichen Werken der Perthes, Biedermann, Wenck, Gustav Freytag u. a. das deutsche 18. Jahrhundert in einem dem englischen Studenten verständlichen Bilde lebendig zu machen, dem er durch die Verwertung von Erinnerungen und Beschreibungen englischer Deutschland-Reisender neue Lichter aufzusetzen sich bemüht. Hieraus erklärt sich der Grundirrtum des Verfassers, der den Gegenstand seiner Arbeit selbst ohne auf eigener Forschung begründete Liebe betrachtete und also nicht erkannte, dass man heute auf der Darstellung der liberalen Männer des 19. Jahrhundert, die in der Paulskirche in Frankfurt ihren schönen Freiheitstraum träumten und die fast verächtlich auf die Epoche des aufgeklärten Absolutismus herabsahen, keine Schilderung der 18. Jahrhunderts aufbauen kann. Die Zeit, da man im 19. Jahrhundert glaubte, es so herrlich weit gebracht zu haben, ist endgültig vorüber, ich kenne keinen ernsthaften Geisteswissenschaftler, der nicht voll Sehnsucht zurückschaute auf das Jahrhundert der französischen Revolution, auf die Epoche der Toleranz und der Humanität, auf das Zeitalter der weltbürgerlichen Verbrüderung und der Hoffnung auf einen ewigen Frieden. Es kann keine kleine Zeit gewesen sein, die einen Lessing und Herder, einen Goethe und Beethoven, einen Alexander und Wilhelm von Humboldt geboren hat! Bruford hat seinem Buche den Untertitel gegeben: "The Social Background of the Literary Revival," aber er hat es mit keinem Wort verständlich zu machen gewusst, dass diese grössten Deutschen die Söhne *dieser* Epoche waren. Sein Wort: "Most of us would not condemn the life of the 18th century aristocrat quite so strongly to-day as our grandfathers did, as Biedermann does" (page 66), bezeichnet seine im Grunde negative Einstellung gegenüber dem ganzen Jahrhundert. Man kann grosse Bücher nicht ohne Liebe schreiben. Ungewollt gesteht Bruford selbst seinen Irrtum in dem Vorwort zur deutschen Ausgabe: "Die individuellen Leistungen führender Geister mussten infolge der soziologischen Betrachtungsweise in den Hintergrund gedrängt werden." Im Gegenteil: eine soziologische Betrachtungsweise hat die Aufgabe, die individuellen Leistungen führender Geister aus den sozialen und geistigen Bedingungen der Zeit zu erklären. Es war der Traum des alten Dilthey, eine "Geschichte des deutschen Geistes" zu schreiben, in der für jede Stufe "auf die Darstellung der sozialwirtschaftlich-politischen Organisation die des geistigen

Kultursystems, insbesondere der Religion und der Dichtung folgen" sollte. Es ist die Aufgabe unsrer Generation, Diltheys Forderung zu erfüllen.

Der Wert der Arbeit von Bruford für den angelsächsischen Studenten, der sich für deutsche Sozialgeschichte interessiert, soll nicht bestritten werden, wenn ein kritischer Lehrer den Schüler auf die Gefahr jeder auf veralteter Forschung aufbauenden Darstellung hinweist. Was aber ist der Sinn der deutschen Ausgabe dieses Buches, dessen Inhalt jeder deutsche Abiturient kennen muss? Man versteht die Absicht der deutschen Ausgabe aus den "Irrtümern" der Übertragung. Dr. Wölcken übersetzt den oben zitierten Satz: "Most of us would not condemn . . ." in "Heute ist man vielleicht nicht mehr ganz so bereit, das Leben des 18. Jahrhunderts in Grund und Boden zu verdammen." (S. 66.) Das Wort "aristocrat" ist ausgelassen, "so strongly" wird "in Grund und Boden" verstärkt. Oder: Bruford spricht von "the infinite richness and diversity of German culture, exploited in the village-story and 'Heimatkunst'" (S. 308). Wölcken übersetzt: "der unendliche Reichtum der deutschen Kultur, den die deutsche Dorfgeschichte und Heimatkunst zeichnet" (S. 312). Nur in Verbindung mit "diversity" kann das Wort "richness" hier einen Sinn haben, ohne dieses wird es lächerlich. In welcher Zeit leben wir, in der der kulturelle Reichtum Deutschlands, der Heimat Goethes und Beethovens, durch den Hinweis auf die "Heimatkunst" der Lienhardt und Bartels bewiesen werden darf!

KARL GEORG WENDRINER

New York

Notkers des Deutschen Werke nach den Handschriften neu herausgegeben von E. H. SEHRT und TAYLOR STARCK. Zweiter Band, Marcianus Capella, De Nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii. Max Niemeyer Verlag, Halle/Saale, 1935, pp. iv-viii, 820. (Altdeutsche Textbibliothek, herausgegeben von Georg Baesecke, Nr. 37).

The present reviewer has had the opportunity to review on former occasions in *MLN* the painstaking effort of two American scholars to furnish a critical edition of the works of Notker Teutonicus. Having finished Notker's Boethius in 1933 and 1934, the editors now offer a second volume containing the first two books of the well-known work of Marcianus Capella according to the sole extant manuscript, in the Stiftsbibliothek, at St. Gall, Cod. 872 (I). As no original manuscripts of Notker have survived, a critical edition seemed a desideratum, especially as Notker apparently had devised for himself, on the whole, a systematic orthogra-

phy to correspond to phonetic conditions. No extant manuscript preserves his orthography in perfection. Even if we allow for some latitude in certain speech habits of every individual, it would hardly be possible to excuse in Notker for instance such irregularity in the application of the admirable "Anlautsgesetz" concerning O. H. G. *d b g f* as is revealed in the statistics of the various texts in: Israel Weinberg, *Zu Notkers Anlautsgesetz*, Tübingen 1911. The "Einleitung" of the edition of Sehrt-Starck assigns the manuscript to two hands, their assignment corresponding exactly with that made by this reviewer a number of years ago, with this difference that the words: *Iôh sâr ûnder ânderên, dîe fône*, p. 114, l. 15 f. seem to belong to scribe *a*. The work of the editors has been done with scrupulous exactness. Among the forest of accents on seven pages of facsimiles the reviewer discovered two slight slips: p. 2₁₆ of the edition: text *wir*, Ms. *wir*, omitted in notes; p. 216₁₉ text *Also*, accent omitted against Ms. *Also*. The addition of the commentary of Remigius of Auxerre used by Notker—among other unknown commentators it seems—from Schulte's investigation (*Forschungen und Funde* III, Münster 1911) is gratifying.

FREDERICK H. WILKENS

New York University

The Works of Edmund Spenser, A Variorum Edition. Edited by EDWIN GREENLAW, CHARLES GROSVENOR OSGOOD, FREDERIC MORGAN PADELFORD. *The Faerie Queene*, Book Four. RAY HEFFNER, Special Editor. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1935. \$6.00.

The fourth volume of this valuable edition occupies considerably less space than any of its three predecessors, some 357 pages compared with 556 of the first volume and 433 of the third and shortest of the earlier volumes. The reason is fairly obvious, viz. that there is less call for elaborate exposition of the allegory, moral or historical. Of the historical element underlying the poem the editors, and those they cite from, note only the obvious reference in the episode of Timias and Belpheobe to the disgrace of Raleigh, his dismissal from Court and subsequent reconciliation. The story as told by Spenser, in which he himself (as Professor Jack points out) is the dove, represents rather the course he wished events to take than their actual history. While this is the only certainly identifiable allusion to contemporary history, it is difficult not to suspect that in the description of the more fickle friendships of Blandamour and Paridell and the quick quarrels and jealousies that spring up Spenser is reflecting, in a general way at any rate, the loves and

friendships at Elizabeth's Court as he had witnessed them during his visit to London to print the first books, and as he refers to them in *Colin Clout's Come Home Again*:

But they of love and of his sacred lere,
(As it should be) all otherwise devise
Than we poor shepherds are accustomed here.
His mighty mysteries they do prophane,
And use his idle name to other needs,
But as compliment for courting vain.
So him they do not serve as they profess,
But make him serve to them for sordid uses.

Spenser is here speaking of love as between the sexes, but that is at least not excluded by Aristotle in his treatment of friendship. For surely husband and wife may be such friends as remain friends because from long familiarity they love each other's dispositions (*Nic. Eth.* VIII. 4, 10). In Spenser's poem, as in Milton's Divorce pamphlets, marriage should be the seal set on the highest type of friendship. In the opening stanzas of Canto IX. Spenser is not contrasting love as between the sexes with friendship between men, at least in an exclusive way. He is contrasting love as passion with love as "the band of virtuous mind" which may and should be the final bond of man and wife. And so it is this book that Britomart finds her Artegall though they are not yet to be united. Each, especially Artegall, has to prove their virtuous mind. Here too we get the beautiful Canto describing how Scudamour found Amoret, the perfect wife in whom are united all the virtues,—Womanhood, Shamefastness, Cherefulness, Modestie, Curtesie, "Soft Silence and submisse Obedience" which Spenser, like Milton, thought should adorn a wife. The present writer would indeed take the opportunity to confess that, in a volume cited here, he has not done full justice to Spenser's consistent endeavour to sublimate Courtly Love, not in Dante's way by making it more ascetic, mystical, but by heightening the ideal of marriage. Mr. Lewis in his *The Allegory of Love*, Oxford, 1936, which unfortunately appeared too recently to be referred to in this volume, has dealt very fully with the subject. It is this aspect of Spenser's poem which explains and justifies Milton's description of Spenser as "a better teacher than Scotus or Aquinas." But it was a difficult task especially for such a lover of beauty the object of passion, "ληγοῦσης δὲ τῆς ἄρας ἐνόστε καὶ ἡ φίλια λήγει." The ancients, Zielinsky in his *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte* declares, never succeeded in linking the love of the poets with the *amicitia* of Cicero's treatise. It was the dream of Spenser and Milton so to do at a time when love was still courtly and marriage a matter of bargaining.

To return to the volume in hand, the connection of Spenser's teaching with its sources in Aristotle and later writers as Cicero, Montaigne, Bacon, Castiglione, &c. is discussed by a number of writers brought together in extracts in an Appendix I. *The Virtue*

of *Friendship and Book Four*. Many interesting and important facts are brought out, e. g. Mr. Erskine's account of Giraldu's *Tre Dialoghi della Vita Civile*. The total result of the Appendix is a little bewildering. One wishes the editor could have summed up, disentangling the inessential—and many identifications of sources are inessential—from the main features of Spenser's enthusiastic idealisation of the spirit of Concord in all its workings. Certainly the poem itself is most interesting when the poet gets away from the rather obvious allegory of the opening Cantos to the beautiful narratives of the doings and loves of Scudamour and Britomart and Artegall &c., and to the delightful irrelevancies of the wedding of Florimell and Marinell.

The notes to the different cantos deal largely with sources and analogies of various interest and importance. The whole makes a pleasant field to wander through, and it is impossible not to be grateful for an edition that gives so much in so readable and beautiful a form.

H. J. C. GRIERSON

Edinburgh, Scotland

A World in the Moon: A Study of the Changing Attitude Toward the Moon in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. By MARJORIE NICOLSON. Northampton, Massachusetts: 1936. Pp. vi + 72. (Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, xvii, No. 2.)

In this study, one of a series dealing with the influence of new scientific discoveries upon popular philosophy and literary imagination, Professor Nicolson shows how, after the telescope had increased man's knowledge of the nature of the moon, there was a renewal of interest in our satellite as a fruitful subject for artists, poets, and philosophers. Traditional themes were revived, and new ones appeared, colored, though not always accurately, by the recent findings of science. Especially prominent was the belief that the moon was another habitable world. This idea, in earlier ages treated in the spirit of fanciful romance, was in the seventeenth century maintained upon scientific grounds, reinforced by additional arguments drawn from the philosophical assumption that the universe is a *plenum formarum*. Miss Nicolson finds, however, that after a period of great popularity in the seventeenth century, the theme of a world in the moon declined in prominence. The progress of the early telescopic investigations had quickly rendered the existence of lunar inhabitants scientifically improbable, if not impossible. For many decades popular writers seemed unaware that their belief in life on the moon could no longer claim scientific support; but when, by 1700, this fact became generally recognized, men's thoughts

turned to speculations concerning the possible inhabitants of other planets and stars. Here the philosophical conception of nature as a *plenum formarum* was again invoked, since it was obvious that the creative power of the Deity could not logically be restricted to a single planet and its satellite. Consequently, the lines of argument most frequently advanced in favor of a world in the moon became in the eighteenth century the mainstays of a belief in a plurality of worlds.

In tracing with her usual insight and learning this fascinating chapter in the history of ideas, Miss Nicolson has presented ample evidence supporting her general thesis that scientific discoveries have introduced new details and methods into the imaginative treatment of perennial literary themes. It is doubtful, however, whether the seventeenth-century allusions to the "borrowed light" of the moon can properly be included among examples of the influence of telescopic knowledge upon literature. Miss Nicolson rightly observes that the idea was a heritage from classical times; but the explanation of the moon's light as the reflected light of the sun was far more widely current before 1610 than she implies. It had been, in fact, the almost universally accepted scientific explanation for some seventeen centuries, being adequately founded upon the observations made during eclipses. Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis* and Pliny's *Natural History*, so popular in the middle ages and the Renaissance, both contain unequivocal statements that the moon "borrows" her light from the sun (the English translations by Newton and Holland use this very word). Numerous other authors set forth the same explanation: Plutarch, Bartholomeus Anglicus, the compiler of *The Mirrour of the World*, Copernicus, Tycho Brahe, and the universally admired Du Bartas. In fact, the idea was so clearly a commonplace of Renaissance thought that seventeenth-century poets would naturally have followed their predecessors in alluding to the moon's light as "borrowed," even though they had never heard of Galileo's discoveries.

FRANCIS R. JOHNSON

Stanford University

The Evolution of Keats's Poetry. By CLAUD LEE FINNEY, 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936. Pp. xx + 804. \$10.00.

That these two ample volumes are a monument of pious labour, unsparingly industrious research, and diligent compilation, is manifest. But that any reader, when with a certain relieved virtue he turns the last page, will have any better understanding of Keats than when he turned the first, is not manifest at all.

In the first place Professor Finney's method of approach, though at the moment in fashion, is dangerous. He says in his preface "In order that I might reproduce and interpret the intuition which Keats expressed in a particular poem, I have attempted to put myself in his place and to subject myself to the sensations and ideas which entered into his mind and out of which he intuited the poem." Even if one grants the odd assumption that any one man, at a distance of more than a hundred years, can so "subject himself to the sensations and ideas" that actuated another, none the less the selves that are subjected are not the same, and the reactions cannot be duplicated. They can hardly be even approximated when one of the men is a great poet and the other is not. Two statements of Professor Finney betray how little fitted he is to understand the workings of a poet's mind—or indeed of anyone's mind. "On October 24 he rejected humanitarianism, resumed his humanistic philosophy of negative capability, and, it is probable, began the humanistic and Miltonic *Hyperion*"; and "He succumbed to egotism for only a month, however; on September 18, we shall see, he subdued his egotistic impulses and resumed his empirical humanism." Does Professor Finney seriously believe that any human being, let alone a great poet, assumes or discards an attitude towards life or his work as he might assume or discard winter underclothes?

This same dogmatic *ex cathedra* certainty vitiates many of Professor Finney's detailed statements. We are perpetually being told that an image in Keats 'was derived' from a particular source; or, in another sphere, "The normal boy experiences this sexual awakening in his sixteenth year, but Keats was nearly twenty-two years of age when he experienced it. The first woman who aroused his sexual feelings was a lady with whom he had a mild flirtation in Hastings in May 1817." How in Heaven's name, or by what mysterious process of identification, does Professor Finney know that?

Professor Finney (like Miss Lowell, whom in some ways he resembles) suffers from an enthusiasm which often overclouds his sense of relevance. The determination of the colour of Keats' eyes or of his hair has at best a very tenuous connection with the evolution of his poetry. Nor are Professor Finney's notions of what constitutes evidence such as inspire confidence in his judgment. For example, "Abbey had a better opportunity than any other person to know the facts about Keats's parents" but his testimony "is refuted by the testimony of Charles Cowden Clarke and George Keats." Why is it refuted except that we should all prefer to accept the contrary testimony? Or "I quote the earlier version from the Scrap-book. It is more authentic than the later version, *for it is inscribed probably in the autograph of George Keats*" (*italics mine*). The authenticity of a transcript depends on the MS from which it was taken and on the mechanical accuracy of the transcription, not on the identity of the transcriber, even if that identity

is certain. (Incidentally, why, if Professor Finney is anxious, as he should be, for the earliest version of a poem, does he quote the Epistle to George Keats as printed, and not as written in the original letter?)

Professor Finney, with a love for the distant and the recondite, is often blind to the near and obvious. He seeks the source of the refrain of *To Hope* in vague parallels in Mary Tighe and Campbell. It was pointed out three years ago (in a book which I assume that Professor Finney has not read) that the refrain is an almost direct quotation from a poem in Mrs. Radcliffe's *Romance of the Forest*. He cites a number, though by no means all, of the parallels in *Endymion* to *The Faithful Sheperdess*, but neglects perhaps the most obvious of all ('*She is so constant to me and so kind—She is untrue, unconstant and unkind*'). Or again "The employment of 'pards,' the French form of the word, indicates Keats's indebtedness to Rabelais." If one was not by this time used to Professor Finney one would rub one's eyes, wondering whether one had read aright. Did he, or Keats, need to look further than Shakespeare for this "French form of the word"?

For a book of this devastating completeness there are some remarkable omissions. In the somewhat cursory treatment of *Isabella* there is no mention of Mirabeau's translation of Boccaccio; and though a good deal of not always accurate play is made elsewhere with Woodhouse's shorthand there is no mention of the note opposite stanza xxxiv that "Keats had been reading Southey's poems again at the time he wrote this stanza." There is no mention of Davies' *Celtic Researches* as a possible influence on *Hyperion*. Baldwin's *Pantheon* is treated as on a par with Tooke's and its significance thereby missed; Spence's *Polymetis* is blocked with Lemprière as a 'classical dictionary,' and the illustrations in it almost neglected. ("The source of this detail"—the 'plump infant laughers'—says Professor Finney, "is obscure." To borrow his own dogmatic tone, it is not obscure at all, but is Spence, Plate VII, fig. 2, and perhaps xxxi, 2, just as the source of *numerous tramplings quiver lightly Along a huge cloud's ridge* is Spence, Plate xxvi, 2.) In deriving Keats' stanza form for the Odes, most improbably, from Spenser, Professor Finney does not even mention Mr. Garrod's brilliant exposition of the derivation from the two sonnet forms.

Professor Finney revives, though with modifications which, if there were any evidence for them, would make it less absurd, Miss Lowell's view of the composition of the two *Hyperions*, a view which one would have supposed adequately demolished by Mr. Murry; and he makes a characteristic comment:—"The original draft of the introduction to the humanitarian version of the *Fall of Hyperion* has not survived." Since there is little likelihood and no proof that it ever existed this is not surprising. His transcripts are not always accurate (for example, by failing to observe how Woodhouse

made his 'ss' Professor Finney produces in a famous letter the odd reading 'proper breast to breast' instead of 'presses breast to breast'). He swallows whole Sir Sidney Colvin's comments on Brown's account of the *Nightingale* Ode, and accepts without question the existing holograph as the first draft; but he pays no attention to Woodhouse's shorthand note indicating that (whether instead of or as well as *keelless*) Keats wrote *ruthless* before he achieved the famous *perilous*.

Some of these defects would be trivial in a book of a different order, a book whose value lay in its ideas; but they are grave in a book which is little more than a compilation of material, marshalled by no more valuable a design than that of affixing to Keats, and then removing, a series of labels, such as 'humanitarian' or 'empirical humanist.' Much of the material, where it is reliable, will be of interest to readers of Keats; but they will, I think, choose to use it in their own way, to help them to a better understanding of a poet's mind and imagination, neglecting a cicerone who may partly understand the first but certainly does not understand the second. The business of 'research,' above all in poetry, is illumination of its object, not sterile display of itself; research therefore is wise to be humble where it is often arrogant, or it will hear not only the poet but his wisely humble readers gently laughing at it from a cloud.

M. R. RIDLEY

Oxford University

John Galt. By JENNIE W. ABERDEIN. London [and N. Y.]: Oxford University Press, 1936. Pp. xxiv + 209. \$3.00.

Charles Dickens's Letters to Charles Lever. Edited by FLORA V. LIVINGSTONE. With an introduction by HYDER E. ROLLINS. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933. Pp. xvii + 65.

Miss Aberdeen's study, actuated by the approaching centenary of Galt's death (1839) and the neglect accorded him by both Britain and the Canada he and his family had a significant part in developing, is devoted to a comprehensive history of Galt's life and writings. The copious bibliographies show that Miss Aberdeen has spared no pains in an effort to command all the material, published and unpublished, available for her purpose. The text is well documented; the material, skilfully assembled (see particularly Galt's unfortunate, tangled relations with the Canada Company); the style is simple and readable.

Galt is depicted as a curious blend of the practical and the philosophical: a man scrupulously honest, often the victim of the unscrupulous, fond of travel, with a restless mind teeming with

projects for the betterment of society, but from natural limitations or external circumstances usually unable to perfect them; yet a man with a quiet, reflective mind capable of tolerant, wise, humorous, and pathetic comment on human kind that is inimitable.

The criticism, while not disregarding the wide variety of Galt's writings, deals chiefly with the fiction. Admiration of his forte, character portraiture, does not, however, blind the critic to faults such as awkwardness with plot, padding, and self-borrowing—factors which must help to account for his neglect by subsequent generations. But she does not, in my judgment, emphasize sufficiently that, like Scott, it is with Scottish characters in the Scottish scene that Galt is at his best. The usefulness of the book would have been increased if the bibliography had been brought up to date, but as the first complete biography of Galt, it is a contribution to our knowledge of a unique literary figure.

The twenty-seven Dickens-Lever letters (together with five by other hands) is important, because, as Professor Rollins points out, it serves to correct the hitherto erroneous impression that the relation between Dickens and Lever was one of indifference if not distinct coolness (p. v).

The introduction, while presenting several matters of interest, seems to me unfortunate in having chosen to skim the cream off the letters before the reader gets a sip at it. Moreover, the method by which particular letters are referred to is sometimes confusing and there is one actual error: the letter mentioned as "from Wills on April 13, 1861, etc." (p. xiv) should be the letter of "25th January, 1861" (see pp. 32-33).

The letters depict Dickens in the rôle of editor and publisher of *All the Year Round* and Lever as a contributor. Dickens accepts Lever's serial, *A Day's Ride*, with great enthusiasm only to find, to his chagrin and distress, after starting to run the novel, that it was not taking, that he was, therefore, losing subscribers, and that he would have to run along with it a novel of his own. This news has to be conveyed by letter to Lever, in ill health and worried over family difficulties. Dickens's letters show how it is done without apparently marring in the least the very cordial friendship between the two men. Literary friendships have snapped from much slighter causes than this. The letters show, too, Dickens's vigorous, disinterested struggle with the Chapmans to get *A Day's Ride* published in book form and his final success. The volume is a pleasant testimony to Dickens's honest and generous nature.

ANNETTE B. HOPKINS

Goucher College

Mr. Pepys upon the State of Christ-Hospital. By RUDOLF KIRK.
Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1935. Pp. xii
+ 66 + 44 facsimiles. \$2.00.

This work will add to the ever growing appreciation of the services of Samuel Pepys to the Royal Navy. It had long been realized that training in mathematics was essential for naval officers, and even in Elizabethan times a beginning was made by Thomas Digges and Thomas Hood. The Dutch wars had again emphasized this need, and in 1673 a more practical step was taken with the establishment by Charles II of a Mathematical School at Christ's Hospital. Until his death Pepys took a very active interest in this foundation.

The present work discusses some of Pepys' earlier reports, telling of the faults of the school and suggested remedies. In the manuscript "Discourse" of 1677 Pepys gives in great detail his views as to the administration of the school, the preparation of the students, and the curriculum. In a second report in 1682 Pepys outlines the qualifications of a master. Above all he believes the teacher should be practical.

In 1698 conditions became so deplorable that Pepys resolved to attract the attention of the authorities by a printed pamphlet, circulated only to those concerned. In the course of the dispute Pepys published six such papers. These rare pamphlets are here reproduced in facsimile, and there is an excellent discussion of the events leading to their publication. In addition to giving some idea as to Pepys' sound views on this kind of mathematical education, this work also tells of the various cross currents, political and particularly religious. Mr. Kirk has made a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the 'other side' of Pepys.

SANFORD V. LARKEY

Welch Medical Library
The Johns Hopkins University

Le Conte de Poitiers, roman du treizième siècle. Édité avec introduction, notes et glossaire par V.-FRÉDÉRIC KOENIG. Paris: Droz, 1937. Pp. xxiii + 61.

Saint Léger. Étude de la langue du manuscrit de Clermont-Ferrand, suivie d'une édition critique du texte avec commentaire et glossaire. Par JOSEPH LINSKILL. Paris: Droz, 1937. Pp. 192.

Introduction à la Fleur des Histoires de Jean Mansel. Par G. DE POERCK. Gand: E. Claeys-Verheughe, 1936. Pp. 101.

Le Conte de Poitiers, the principal source of the *Roman de la Violette*, has not been republished since 1831, when Francisque

Michel made an edition that has become very rare. Accordingly, the present competent and careful edition of this entertaining tale is most welcome. The editor plausibly traces the chief theme—the Cymbeline or wager motive—to an *exemplum* designed to glorify the Blessed Virgin and shows how this theme has been developed by an author acquainted with various chansons de geste, with the Alexander and Troy romances, and with the *Eracle* of Gautier d'Arras. The author, a Picard who wrote between 1204 and 1210 (Koenig's dates seem more acceptable than those proposed by Gaston Paris and Ohle), was a poet of no great inventiveness or technical skill, but his narrative has the refreshing virtues of brevity and directness, virtues not to be despised after the *longueurs* of some of the later romances and chansons de geste.

The edition is entirely satisfactory and the following suggestions in no way affect its value. A closer analysis of the imperfect rhymes cited on pp. xv-xvi would have been useful: some of them result from phenomena of pronunciation noted by K. elsewhere, some from other phenomena equally common at the time, e. g. *r* lightly pronounced in certain positions, *s* beginning to be silent before *t*, slight nasalization of certain vowels, especially *i*, sporadic appearance of analogical *s* (incidentally Gautier 989 is probably a vocative without *s*, whereas *chevaliers* in the plural nominative, established by the rhyme in l. 82, may be due to the copyist in 94). Few misprints have been noted in the text, but *çou* and *ço* frequently appear without the cedilla and the reading should be *après* in 157 and 1367. The note to 937 *sqq.* queries the correctness of the text at this point, although there is no reason for skepticism: a furred *peligon* was sometimes worn under a fur-lined *mantel* (see E. Goddard, *Women's Costume*, pp. 190-1). In the Glossary, *aufferrant* 614 should be glossed as an adjective (for *cheval* read *impétueux*) and *siglaton* 664 should be glossed by *manteau*, not *étouffe*. The *Table des Noms Propres* lists certain saints' names as "saints invoqués" without further identifying them; as an instance of the author's concern for verisimilitude (cf. p. xiv), it may be worth noting that some care is used in these oaths: the Duke of Normandy swears by St. Nicaise, martyr and bishop of Rheims, King Pepin by St. Denis, the Count of Poitiers by St. Martial, etc. The St. Amandus of l. 530, bishop of Maestricht and closely identified with Flanders, probably bears added witness to the Picard origin of the author. Harpin, identified as "neveu du comte de Poitiers," is clearly that in l. 624, but it might have been pointed out that he is the count's cousin in ll. 880 and 1006-8.

A thorough investigation of the *Saint Léger* was much to be desired. Unfortunately, the present volume, though seemingly exhaustive, only partially supplies our needs. The text is usable, if at times debatable, but the edition contains no literary or historical study of the poem, and certain fundamental assumptions in the linguistic part of the book raise doubts as to the validity of its conclusions here. The editor seems to believe, for example, that although medieval scribes were imperfect spellers, medieval authors were invariably consistent (cf. p. 9: "Mais puisqu'il n'est guère vraisemblable que l'auteur du poème se soit servi de deux graphies [read: sons dif-

férents?] pour représenter le même son [read: la même voyelle latine?], une de ces graphies doit être sans valeur phonétique.”). Similarly, in certain instances where the poet elides a final *e* and the scribe represents this elision by omitting the vowel, the editor confuses his reader by such clumsy statements as: “la liaison est sans doute due au scribe” (p. 151; cf. also p. 34). The difficulties involved in determining the dialect of a very old French text that was later copied by a Provençal scribe can hardly be exaggerated, but one’s confidence in the ability of the present edition to solve these difficulties is shaken when one investigates a word like *ols* and finds that on pp. 19-20, where its vowel is discussed, no decision regarding the form can be reached, while on p. 140 (for 174 read 171) the absence of *z* after *l* in this word is regarded as a picardism and on p. 167 the form is flatly called a provençalism.

The *Fleur des Histoires* belongs in a sense to the religious and didactic literature of the Middle Ages, but since its author took pains to interlard his stories from the Bible, his saints’ lives, miracles, *exempla*, etc. with numerous “entremets” of a lay character, the compilation constitutes a remarkably complete store-house of medieval lore. One finds there not only the “history” of the Trojans, Assyrians, Medes, Persians, Greeks, Egyptians, Britons, Romans and French (through the reign of Charles VI), but also tales about Vergil the Necromancer, a geographical treatise, a description of the monuments of Rome, even—in a few late redactions—prose versions of the *Griselda* and *Girard de Roussillon* stories. None of the matter is original with the compiler, Jean Mansel d’Hesdin (ca. 1400-73), but because of this fact scholars seeking additional versions of material encountered in isolation elsewhere may find the mss. of the *Fleur des Histoires* of considerable use. (For example, one of them contains a copy of *Griseldis*, “traduction B,” which is not listed in the *Histoire de Griseldis en France* by Golenistcheff-Koutousoff.)

Since this huge compilation was revised several times and since it exists, in whole or in part, in over fifty mss., the task of listing, classifying and dating the various redactions was not an easy one. De Poerck seems to have done the work well. He has also extracted from the mss. and from contemporary documents all that we are likely to know about Mansel. Citations from the prologues, analyses and lists of contents add to the usefulness of the book, which also contains plates illustrating three of the mss. De P. promises a study of the sources of the *Fleur* and it is to be hoped that this important addition to his Introduction may soon become available.

GRACE FRANK

Bryn Mawr College

BRIEF MENTION

German Visitors to English Theaters in the Eighteenth Century. By JOHN ALEXANDER KELLY. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1936. Pp. 178. \$2.00. This study is a welcome addition to our knowledge of German-English relations during the eighteenth century. With great care and acumen the author presents to us the views of German travellers concerning the English stage and English acting as found in descriptions of travels and in books on England from 1696 to the end of the eighteenth century. Much material that has been practically unknown or that is very inaccessible is made available. It is an interesting panorama of German visitors in England all giving their opinion on the same subject. As might be expected there is much agreement and disagreement. Among the travellers quoted we find such names as Muralt, Haller, Hagedorn, von Pöllnitz, Alberti, Mylius, Ewald, Kielmannsegge, Volkmann, Möser, Sturz, Füssli, Lichtenberg, Archenholtz, Bahrdt, Reinhold Forster, Moritz, Küttner, Brandes, Sophie von LaRoche, Wendeborn, Meister, George Forster, Schütz, von Schön, besides others less well known.

Exception must be taken to the author's use of the word anglo-mania. Anglo-mania denotes an excessive, undue or unreasonable admiration for or attachment to England and things English. It implies a fault. But for the Germans to recognize, during the greater part of the eighteenth century, the superiority of English culture cannot be called anglo-mania. It is merely the recognition of patent facts. Neither Bodmer nor Klopstock nor Lessing was afflicted with anglo-mania, though they got much of their inspiration from English sources. I cannot see that any of the men treated in the study were suffering from anglo-mania with the exception of Büschel and possibly Lehzen. Most of them were greatly impressed with the excellence of the English theater and English acting, as they might well be, but there is hardly one among them who is not also critical. Chapter headings like "Rise of Anglo-mania" or "Peak of Anglo-mania" are altogether misleading. Nor is the title of the last chapter "Critical Visitors" more appropriate. We find criticism in the earlier chapters and high praise on the part of the "critical visitors." There is no uniform consistent development in the views concerning the English stage which would allow generalization as to periods. We have the opinions of German individualists more or less colored by the changing conditions of their own country and of the English stage. In spite of this misconception the book is a distinct contribution to an interesting segment of the vast field of Anglo-German relations.

JOHN A. WALZ

Harvard University

William Blake, Versuch einer Entwicklungsgeschichte des Mystikers. Erster Teil. Von WALDEMAR BAGDASARIANZ. Zürich: Max Niehan, 1936. Pp. 171. (Swiss Studies in English, II.) Herr Bagdasarianz does not attempt any new interpretation of Blake's prophetic writings. Regarding them as intelligible only here and there, he bases his exposition on the early tracts, the marginalia, miscellaneous aphorisms, and the primary antitheses embodied in the early prophetic books, at which point this first part of the Study concludes. The four chapters—not including the brief introduction—might be described as an exposition of the Contraries from various points of view. Faith and Knowledge, Good and Evil, Freedom and the Law, the Twofold Life, are the leading topics. Yet the Blakean doctrine of the Contraries is, in my opinion, missed. In Herr Bagdasarianz's exposition the Contraries become an out-and-out duality, which Blake wished at all costs to avoid, and they are further evaluated into Good and Evil, the very thing against which Blake protested. The "marriage" of the Contraries is described as the absorption of the evil principle into the good one. But the condition of absorption is not Blake's "marriage"; it is his "hermaphrodite." Again, Energy and Repose are described as Life and Death. But Repose, in its proper function, is not death; it is a part of a necessary polarity; it is one of two Contraries, both of which are good. It is death only when it assumes to itself a false activity and tries to check the flow of energy, as the "moral codes" compel it to do. Finally, Love is set over against Reason and made the supreme virtue. Many Christian mystics do indeed take this position, but Blake does not. He decries Love as much as he does Reason. He has a right love and a wrong love, a right reason and a wrong reason. His supreme virtue is Intellect, which is unselfish reason animated by unselfish love, but in this relationship love is second, not the first. Intellect is king. While Herr Bagdasarianz, in my opinion, has failed to grasp Blake's metaphysics, he often writes of the issues involved with great sympathy and insight. There are many pages to which I would take no exception and certain topics, such as Innocence and Experience, the fallen world as a manifestation of the fallen self, the One and the Many as they apply to Blake, are discussed here more adequately, I believe, than anywhere else.

M. O. PERCIVAL

Ohio State University

Studies in Shelley. By AMIYAKUMAR SEN. Calcutta: Calcutta University Press, 1936. Pp. xvi + 343. In five essays Mr. Sen studies the relations of Shelley to six of the principal influences upon his thought—Locke, Hume, Baron d'Holbach, Godwin, East-

ern philosophy, and the French Revolution. It is impossible to trace Shelley's beliefs to their sources with anything like the finality that Mr. Sen's method assumes in treating various influences *seriatim*. An eager young man of quick, subtle and independent mind, reading steadily in seven different languages, passes through such a vast thicket of intellectual experiences that individual thorn-pricks are not readily isolated. Not even the most careful comparative analyses can always determine whether it was from Lucretius, Condorcet, Godwin, Paine, Hume, d'Holbach or Voltaire that Shelley first fished up some particular murex. In the main, however, Mr. Sen contents himself with general similarities that are sound. He is particularly enlightening in his treatment of Shelley's indebtedness to Locke and to Indian philosophy. Even here one wonders, in the first instance, if the introspective habits caught from Locke were solely responsible for turning Shelley into a rebel. In the second instance Mr. Sen concludes too hastily that Shelley's ultimate belief in the unreality of "real" phenomena *had* to come from the strikingly significant passages cited from Sir William Jones' translations. Any reader of the tenth book of the Republic might deduce the same idea from Plato, even though Zellner, as quoted by Mr. Sen, thinks Plato meant otherwise. Perhaps Mr. Sen's best service lies not in demonstrating particular and general indebtedness, but in showing Shelley's essential independence even when professing discipleship. This is particularly true in the case of Godwin. Yet here, too, one is surprised at finding Shelley's gradualism considered as if the difference were mainly between *Prometheus Unbound* and *A Philosophical View of Reform*, when it is equally true of Shelley's *published* verse and prose at almost any time. Mr. Sen is often vague or mistaken in chronological details,—see pages 20, 21, 63, 68, 76, 258, 268 for chronological vagueness.

NEWMAN I. WHITE

Duke University

Daily Meditations, by PHILIP PAIN. Reproduced from the original edition of 1668 in the Huntington Library. With an introduction by LEON HOWARD. San Marino, California: Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, 1936. Pp. 36. \$0.75. Pain's *Daily Meditations* was popular enough in Puritan New England to earn two printings, in 1668 and 1670. The present reproduction is from the only known copy of the first edition, and contains an excellent introduction by Mr. Howard. Without magnifying the very modest literary merits of Pain's poems, he shows that they were written by someone who had read somewhat in the English metaphysical poets, and certainly was reasonably familiar with Herbert and Quarles. If Pain was a New Englander, this is a fact of some

interest, and his little book is a considerable item in the short list of such works published in the colonies in the seventeenth century. Unfortunately no one has been able to identify Pain. According to the title-page he was drowned in a shipwreck some time between July, 1666, when the *Meditations* was begun, and 1668, when it was printed. Support for the statement about the nature of his death may possibly be drawn from the suggestion in the verses that he was a seaman, or at least familiar with life afloat. The images drawn from ships and the ocean are frequent, even though they are commonplace enough to be drawn from books rather than from direct experience. Still, where there are no facts speculation is permissible, and one may guess that Pain was a young man, with a taste for books and strong pious convictions, who, whether English or colonial, followed the sea and was, if not resident there, at least well enough known in Boston so that his little book could find an interested audience among its citizens.

KENNETH B. MURDOCK

Harvard University

Die Lyrik und ihr Publikum im England des 18. Jahrhunderts. By VICTOR LANGE. Weimar: Hermann Böhlau Nachfolger, 1935. Pp. viii + 118. RM 3.35. (Literature und Leben, 2.) This study, endeavouring to describe the taste of 18th-century readers, pursues in part the method employed by Professor Havens in his article, "Changing Taste in the Eighteenth Century."¹ It is, however, vague in its aim and uncertain in its procedure. Most of the book does not treat of the true lyric or the song, but of the short poem, and no serviceable distinction is made between different types. If we are interested in such questions as the extent to which the true lyric was enjoyed, or the popularity of certain Restoration songs, we can find no answer in *Die Lyrik und ihr Publikum*. Moreover, the author makes little attempt to relate his conclusions concerning the poetical miscellanies to what we already know about 18th-century taste; consequently his generalisations, where they are valid, are valid only as accounts of the taste for poetical miscellanies. He is led somewhat astray by taking at their face value the statements of editors and compilers as to their purpose in issuing various miscellanies. It is not safe to assume that an editor invariably disclosed his real motive nor that each miscellany was issued in response to a popular demand, or reflected a wide-spread taste. There are several minor inaccuracies in this study which should have been corrected before publication.

EDWARD NILES HOOKER

University of California at Los Angeles

¹ PMLA., xlv (1929), 501 ff.

The Book of Apollonius. Translated into English verse by RAYMOND L. GRISMER and ELIZABETH ATKINS. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1936. Pp. xix + 113. Translating poetry from one language into another is seldom worth the effort; in this case the choice of a verse rather than a prose rendering has been particularly ill-advised. The sense has been mechanically repeated, but the jolting octosyllabic doggerel does not remotely suggest the quality of the Spanish original, nor can it be called readable in its own right. Here is a fair sample:

A man came who was a procurer,
He very much wished to secure her.
He doubled what the lord would pay,
Thinking to hire her in vile way.

(p. 69)

Six hundred-odd stanzas of this sort of thing are a severe trial to the most docile student or the most patient of readers; it is not easy to see how the general appreciation of Spanish poetry can possibly be enhanced by it. The introduction does not offer anything new, and repeats much that is open to serious question, especially in the section dealing with the ultimate origin of the story. The authors' mincing prose, too, is not appreciably superior to their verse. Such unlovely shorthand as "name-character" (p. xix) may perhaps be overlooked, but can such a revealing euphemism as this on page ii: "... a wealthy merchant, whom she murders while he is intoxicated?"

PHILIP H. GOEPP, 2ND.

Bildhaftigkeit im französischen Argot. Von IRMGARD SCHULTZ. Giessen: 1936. Pp. 109. M. 4. Giessener Beiträge zur romanischen Philologie herausgegeben von Kurt Glaser, XXVII. Le titre du travail en question est trop prétentieux: comme il arrive si souvent pour des "dissertations" allemandes, le professeur a indiqué un beau titre et la "dissertanda" n'a pas su élaborer le travail correspondant. Une œuvre scientifique de valeur sur le caractère pittoresque de l'argot français ne saurait en effet être conçue que par un savant ayant mûri pendant des années une philosophie du langage propre à lui. Quel sens un ramassis de transferts de sens "pittoresques" peut-il avoir? Ne savions-nous pas que l'argot est pittoresque? Fallait-il le prouver par des listes de mots? Encore si les solutions de questions étymologiques pendantes étaient nouvelles! L'auteur de notre travail recourt même aux anciennes étiquettes de feu Wilhelm Wundt: "cause pour effet" pour expliquer *raser*, *barber*, *bassiner*, *scier* 'ennuyer'—ce logicisme désuet qu'a-t-il à faire avec la 'création picturale' du langage? Est-ce que le constat logique 'effet pour cause' explique véritablement la métaphore *refroidir qc.* 'tuer' ("völlig sachliche

[!], der Wirklichkeit ohne affektische Übertreibung entsprechende Bezeichnung . . .", p. 75—je pensais que dans *refroidir* la "Sachlichkeit" était *cruelle*, comme l'est toute objectivité quand il s'agit de la vie d'un frère humain—décidément, Mlle Schultz est trop 'sachlich,' trop logicisante!)? Ces listes ne sont animées par aucun sens d'humour: (p. 89) "Wie gesagt, drückt der volkstüml. Argot das Empfinden der Entrüstung und Geringschätzung gegenüber der Dummheit durch Nennung gewisser, auch sonst in der Auffassung des Volkes niedrig bewerteter Körperteile aus"—il s'agit, n'en déplaise au lecteur, de *couillon*, *con*, *cul* employés pour 'lâche, poltron, idiot' etc.: *cucul* (qui est 'hypochoristique,' ce que l'auteur écrit 'hypochochistique') ressortirait de la "mentalité des cultivés." Tout cela n'est pas sérieux! Mlle Schultz a en plus une conception *statique* de l'argot dont on pourrait décrire les qualités, alors que l'argot est mouvement, un mouvement d'émancipation incessamment renouvelé. D'ailleurs on ne sait pas bien ce que Mlle Schultz se représente sous le mot d'argot d'après ses explications trop brèves p. 1-2: est-ce qu'il embrasse "alles das, was nicht zum guten Hochfranzösisch gehört," par conséquent aussi la langue familière et, ce qui ne semble pas le cas, les dialectes? Dans un article que, naturellement, présentant son travail à l'université de Giessen, elle devait passer sous silence, j'avais pourtant essayé de préciser la notion d'argot. Pourquoi nous décrit-on les qualités soi-disant stables d'un être mythique "Argot," dont les contours nets ne sont pas même arrêtés dans la tête de l'auteur?

LEO SPITZER

The Johns Hopkins University

The Sources of the Play Cyrano de Bergerac. By HOBART RYLAND. New York: Institute of French Studies (1936). Pp. x + 167. \$1.75. A Chicago realtor claimed with apparent sincerity that his *Merchant Prince of Cornville* was the original of *Cyrano* and even got a decision from the Supreme Court of his state. Fortunately Judge Hand of New York took a different view in 1920, but students of the drama may like to know what the fuss was about. Mr. Ryland will satisfy their curiosity by his ample analysis of Gross' play and by reprinting in full the fifth act and discussing at length the legal proceedings. His belief that the "Supreme Court of Illinois cannot be blamed enough for its erroneous decision" is welcome, but one cannot accept his conclusion that Rostand, having read the Chicago play, was inspired to write his own and "quite unconsciously used the balcony scene and perhaps a few other minor parts" (p. 142). The fact that Rostand could have seen at Paris a copy of the older play does not

prove that he read it. The only parallel that can be drawn is that each play has a balcony scene in which a man prompts another, then takes his place, but the characters and language are entirely different, balcony scenes are frequent, and the situations may easily have been conceived independently, for, after giving to Cyrano wit without beauty and to Christian beauty without wit, Rostand could hardly have failed to employ both prompting and substitution. Moreover, there is no proof that the balcony scene was the point of departure for *Cyrano*. It consequently seems reasonable to accept Rostand's statement that he had not read the rival play, even though it is accompanied by mistakes in dates. The rest of Mr. Ryland's work is unimportant and his bibliographical knowledge is insufficient. Following Nodier and Paul Lacroix, he asserts that Cyrano's *Agrippine* "predates anything of importance by Corneille" and that the latter must have used it since he "had not hesitated to use material by Diamante." This despite the facts that Cyrano was seventeen when *le Cid* appeared and that it was Diamante who imitated Corneille, not Corneille Diamante. Such errors, added to indifferent proof-reading, show need for editorial guidance. The distinguished scholars whose names, constituting an "honorary committee," adorn the advertisement of the series seem to have no function "fors l'honneur."

H. C. L.

Das Bremer mittelniederdeutsche Arzneibuch des Arnoldus Donelhey. Mit Einleitung und Glossar herausgegeben von ERNST WINDLER, 1932. Karl Wachholtz Verlag, Neumünster, pp. xv, 69 (Text), 70-84 (Glossaries and abbreviations). Denkmäler herausgegeben vom Verein für niederdeutsche Sprachforschung, Bd. VII. Windler states in an introductory remark that this edition is supplementary to the dissertation of Franz Willeke, *Das Arzneibuch des Arnoldus Donelhey*, Münster i. W., 1912, pp. 71. The Introduction of Windler is based in the main on Willeke, who has concentrated his efforts on the sources of the *Bremer Arzneibuch*, benefiting from the work of predecessors. Apart from the welcome glossaries the work of Windler has been the editing of the text, which belongs to the Staatsarchiv at Hannover, Msc. AA 16, where it was examined by the reviewer. The editing is careful, but this reviewer regrets to find that Windler has in many cases departed from the fairly consistent manner in which the scribe has observed the spacing of the words. In some cases the scribe's practice may be merely an orthographic peculiarity, but in other cases there is a suspicion that it betrays peculiarity of pronunciation, while Windler's changes at times seem biased by modern habits of pronunciation. This system of changing the orthographical peculiarities of texts existing in one manuscript only seems

deplorable and greatly hampers research work in orthography. The standardising of classical texts is to be approved owing to an absolutely different situation.

FREDERICK H. WILKENS

New York University

A. E. Housman, A Sketch together with a list of his writings and indexes to his Classical papers. By A. S. F. Gow. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1936. Pp. xiv + 137. \$1.75. Prospective readers of this painstaking and valuable little book must not be misled by the subtitle "A Sketch." The biographical text of 57 pages is the account of Housman's career as scholar and makes no attempt to sketch the poet as a personality aside from such traits as were revealed in his relations with his material and his fellow scholars. It has long been known that Housman was a brilliant and acid commentator when his controversial spirit was aroused; in the present volume we have accounts of his disputes, together with quotations from his argument. His editorial labours are described in detail with reference to his academic career. Bearing in mind Housman's prohibition against collecting or reprinting his writing which appeared in periodical publications, the author, in reference to the bibliography which fills two thirds of his pages, warns the readers "to remember why they have to look for his papers in the places of their original publication, and to reflect that the earlier a paper is, the less certainly does it represent the author's (Housman's) mature opinion."

ROBERT HILLYER

Harvard University

Supplement for the Years 1930-1935 to A Shakespeare Bibliography. By WALTHER EBISCH and LEVIN L. SCHÜCKING. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1937. Pp. viii + 104. \$1.75. A welcome supplement, which lists both new studies and earlier ones which escaped the useful work noticed in this journal for November, 1932 (XLVII, 486). It is to be hoped that additional volumes will appear from time to time.

H. S.

Early this year an American branch of the new Istituto Inter-universitario Italiano was established at the Casa Italiana of Columbia University under the direction of Dr. H. R. Marraro which, should it fulfill its announced program, will be of keen interest to students and teachers intending to continue academic studies at an

Italian university. The new *Rivista* of the Institute, published with the title *Romana* by Le Monnier in Florence, will, judging from the issues so far, deserve the attention of all scholars of Italian literature. Outstanding to date is the April-May number containing various articles on Italian literature by such eminent critics as Giulio Bertoni, Luigi Russo, G. B. Angioletti and G. Titta Rosa, and an excellent bibliography of contemporary Italian literature and criticism compiled and continued in later issues by Enrico Falqui.

CHARLES S. SINGLETON

Since 1931 the Huntington Library of San Marino, California, has published, usually twice a year, a quarto *Bulletin* devoted to bibliographies and excellent scholarly articles based on the library's remarkable collections. The *Bulletin* is now replaced by two publications: *Huntington Library Lists*, devoted to bibliographies, and *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, an attractively-printed octavo containing learned articles, for which subscriptions at \$5.00 a year are being solicited. We may confidently expect that the new quarterly will maintain the high standards of the *Bulletin* and give us articles of more than ordinary interest and importance.

R. D. H.

Supplément au Répertoire bibliographique se rapportant à la littérature géographique française de la Renaissance. Par GEOFFROY ATKINSON. Paris: Picard, 1936. Pp. 88. In his *Répertoire bibliographique* of 1927 Dr. Atkinson described over 500 geographical texts, published before 1610. In his new publication he adds descriptions of some 40 more and corrections of the preceding list. The work is handsomely printed in quarto format, with a reproduction of the title-page of *les Singularitez de la France antarctique* of 1557.

H. C. L.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received.]

Anderson, Charles Roberts.—Journal of a cruise to the Pacific ocean, 1842-1844, in the frigate *United States*; with notes on Herman Melville. *Durham*: Duke U. Press, 1937. Pp. x + 143; 11 illus. \$2.50.

Craigie, William A.—Northern words in modern English. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press [New York: Oxf. U. Press], 1937. \$0.85. (S. P. E. Tract, L, 325-362.)

Dunning, T. P.—Piers Plowman, An interpretation of the A-text. *Dublin*: Talbot, 1937. Pp. x + 214. 8/6 sh.

Feilitzen, Olof von.—The pre-conquest personal names of Domesday book. *Uppsala*: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1937. Pp. xxxii + 430. (Nomina germanica, 3.)

Groom, Bernard.—The formation and use of compound epithets in English poetry from 1579. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press [New York: Oxf. U. Pr.], 1937. \$0.85. (S. P. E. Tract, XLIX, 293-324.)

Johnson, Francis R.—Astronomical thought in Renaissance England, A study of the English scientific writings from 1500 to 1645. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1937. Pp. xvi + 357. \$3.25. (Huntington Library publications.)

McColley, Grant.—The Man in the Moone and Nuncius Inanimatus. *Northampton*: Smith College, 1937. Pp. xiv + 78. \$0.75. (Smith College studies in modern languages, XIX, 1.)

Mutschmann, H.—Milton's Projected epic on the rise and future greatness of the Britannic nation, together with a reprint of the anonymous pamphlet entitled Great Britain's ruin plotted by seven sorts of men, 1641. *Tartu*: J. G. Krüger, Ltd., 1936. Pp. 87.

Noyes, Gertrude E.—Bibliography of courtesy and conduct books in seventeenth-century England. *New Haven*: the Author, 1937. Pp. iv + 111.

Rathbone, Isabel E.—The meaning of Spenser's fairyland. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1937. Pp. xii + 275. \$3.25. (Columbia U. studies in English and comparative literature, no. 131.)

Reade, Aleyn Lyell.—Johnsonian gleanings, part VIII: a miscellany. *London*: the Author, 1937. Pp. vi + 216. 25/-.

Stoll, Elmer Edgar.—Shakespeare's young lovers. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1937. Pp. x + 118. \$2.00. (Alexander lectures.)

GERMAN

Ackerknecht, Erwin.—Gottfried Keller. [Das deutsche Leben. Bd. 5]. *Berlin*: Widukind-Verlag, 1937. 56 pp. M. 1.50.

Ancker, Ilse.—Deutsche Faustdichtungen nach Goethe. Diss. *Berlin*: Triltsch & Huther, 1937. 171 pp.

Beckmann, Bernhard.—Sprachliche und textkritische Untersuchungen zu Johann von Würzburg. Diss. *Berlin*. *Emsdetten*: Lechte, 1937. 98 pp.

Behringer, Joh. Georg. u. Zumtobel, Reinhold.—Hausen im Wiesental, das Heimatdorf unseres alemannischen Dichters Johann Peter Hebel. *Hausen*: 1937. 256 pp. 8 plates. M. 3.50.

Berndt, Albrecht.—Die Bedeutung der Frau in der Dichtung deutscher Romantiker. Diss. *Königsberg*. *Würzburg*: Triltsch, 1937. iii, 106 pp. M. 2.80.

Braun, Wilhelm Hans.—Die Friedberger Runenspange. [Aus: Friedberger Geschichtsblätter. Bd. 12]. *Friedberg i. H.*: Binder-nagel [1937]. Pp. 25-36.

Bulst, Walther.—Eine Sequenz auf Otto II. [Nachrichten v. d. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen. Philol.-hist. Kl. Fachgr. 4, N. F. Bd. 2, Nr. 3]. *Göttingen*: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1937. Pp. 67-85. M. 1.

Cowden, M. C., and A. van Eerden.—An Introduction to College German. *Boston*: Heath [1937]. xxii, 205 pp. \$1.40.

Deutsche Volkslieder mit ihren Melodien hrsg. vom Deutschen Volksliedarchiv. Zweiter Bd. Erste Hälfte: Deutsche Volkslieder Balladen Unter Mithilfe von Gerhard Heilfurth und Sascha Wingenroth gemeinsam mit Wilhelm Heiske, Fred Quellmalz, Erich Seemann und Walter Wiora hrsg. von John Meier. *Berlin*: de Gruyter & Co., 1937. 218 pp. 4°. M. 14.

Eberhard, Philipp.—Die politischen Anschauungen der christlich-deutschen Tischgesellschaft. Untersuchungen zum Nationalgefühl Achim von Arnims, Baron de la Motte-Fouqué, Heinrich von Kleists und Adam Müllers. Diss. [Erlanger Arbeiten zur deutschen Literatur. 7]. *Erlangen*: Palm & Enke, 1937. viii, 95 pp. M. 3.50.

Eckardt, Olga.—Die Sportsprache von Nürnberg und Fürth. Eine volkssprachliche Untersuchung. Diss. [Fränkische Forschungen. 8]. *Erlangen*: Palm & Enke, 1937. vii, 64 pp. M. 2.40.

Ernst, Paul. Der junge Paul Ernst. 1866-1886. [Sammlung zur Lebensgeschichte Paul Ernsts. Bd. 1 = Jahrbuch d. Paul-Ernst-Ges. (4.) 1937]. *Berlin-Steglitz*: Paul-Ernst-Ges. 1937. 122 pp. 6 plates. M. 2.50.

Errante, Vincenzo.—La personalità di Rilke. [Kaiser Wilhelm-Institut für Kunst- und Kulturwissenschaft. Bibliotheca Herti-

ana in Rom. Veröffentlichungen der Abteilung für Kulturwissenschaft. Reihe 1, H. 4]. *Leipzig*: Heinrich Keller, 1937. 24 pp. M. 0.80.

[Fehse, Wilhelm. — Wilhelm Raabe. Sein Leben und seine Werke. Mit 14 Federzeichnungen Wilhelm Raabes und 3 Bildtafeln. [Braunschweig:] Vieweg [1937]. 674 pp. M. 12.

[Fliegner, Gotthard. — Geistliches und weltliches Rittertum im Rolandslied des Pfaffen Konrad. [Deutschkundliche Arbeiten. A, Bd. 9]. *Breslau*: Maruschke & Berendt, 1937. xii, 79 pp. M. 3.

[Franz, Alfred. — Der pädagogische Gehalt der deutschen Romantik. Zur erziehungswissenschaftlichen Würdigung des romantischen Romans. (Aus dem Institut für Philosophie, Psychologie und Pädagogik der Techn. Hochschule, Dresden). [Erziehungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen. 6]. *Leipzig*: Meiner, 1937. iv, 132 pp. M. 5.40.

Gättke, Walter. — Heinrich Behnken und sein Werk. Eine Würdigung des niederdeutschen Dramatikers. *Verden/Aller*: Mahnke [1937]. 16 pp.

Gerstäcker, Friedrich. — Germelshausen. With visible Vocabulary and Notes by Paul W. Whitaker. *Boston*: Heath [1937]. 46 pp. and Vocabulary. \$0.48.

Göller, Otto. — Festschrift zur Feier des hundertsten Geburtstages von Volksschriftsteller Dr. Heinrich Hansjakob. . . [Haslach i. K.: W. Engelberg, 1937]. 20 pp. 50 Pf.

Goethes Hermann und Dorothea, ed. with Notes and Vocabulary by A. Busse und G. Keil. *Boston*: Heath [1937]. xxiv, 178 pp. \$1.20.

Heigener, Hans. — Niederdeutsche Mundarten im Kreise Herzogtum Lauenburg. [Sprache und Volkstum. 7 = Forschungen, hrsg. für den Verein für niederdeutsche Sprachforschung, N. F. Reihe A, 7]. *Hamburg*: Wachholtz, 1937. 89 pp. M. 3.

[Helm, Karl. — Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte. Bd. 2, Tl. 1: Die nachrömische Zeit, 1. Die Ostgermanen. [German. Bibliothek. Abt. 1, Reihe 5, Bd. 2 = Religionswiss. Bibliothek, Bd. 5]. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1937. 76 pp. M. 2.40.

Heyd, Günther. — Goethe als Mensch und Deutscher. *Potsdam*: Rütten & Loening [1937]. 74 pp. M. 1.80.

[Hildebrand, Erich. — Über die Stellung des Liedes vom Herzog Ernst in der mittelalterlichen Literaturgeschichte und Volkskunde. [Diss. Marburg = Volk. Ergänzungsreihe. Bd. 2]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1937. ix, 86 pp. M. 2.40.

[Höfle, Frieda. — Cottas Morgenblatt für gebildete Stände und seine Stellung zur Lite-

ratur und zur literarischen Kritik. Diss. München. *Berlin*: Buchdruckerei Gutenberg, 1937. 154 pp.

Howald, Ernst. — Der Mythos als Dichtung. *Leipzig, Zürich*: Niehans [1937]. 107 pp. M. 2.40.

[Jenal, Emil. — Wolfgang Menzel als Dichter, Literaturhistoriker und Kritiker. Diss. Freiburg, Schweiz. [Neue deutsche Forschungen. Abt. Neuere deutsche Literaturgeschichte. Bd. 10]. *Berlin*: Junker & Dünnhaupt, 1937. 156 pp. M. 6.80.

Kästner, Erich. — Pünktchen und Anton. Ed. for school use by Frederick Betz. *Boston*: Heath [1937]. iv, 128 pp. \$1.00.

[Kayser, Wolfgang. — Deutsche Balladen. Ausgewählt. [Literarhistorische Bibliothek. Bd. 20]. *Berlin*: Junker & Dünnhaupt, 1937. 146 pp. M. 3.40.

Kessler, Gerhard. — Die Familiennamen des ostpreussischen Salzburger. *Königsberg*: Wichern-Buchhandlung, 1937. 124 pp. M. 4.

Klemm, Karl. — Das Paradoxon als Ausdruckform der spekulativen Mystik Sebastian Francks. Diss. *Leipzig*: Spamer, 1937. 92 pp.

Kneisel, Gotthold. — Volkhafte Dichtung in Österreich. Junge Dichtung als Spiegelbild inneren Volkstumes. *Graz*: Leuschner & Lubensky, 1937. 50 pp. M. 2.

Kuder, Manfred. — Die deutschbrasilianische Literatur und das Bodenständigkeitsgefühl der deutschen Volksgruppe in Brasilien. Eine literaturgeschichtliche und volkstümliche Untersuchung. Diss. *Breslau*. [Amer. Ibero-Amerikanisches Archiv. Jg. 10, H. 4]. *Berlin*: Dümmler, 1937. 102 pp.

[Kuoni, Clara. — Wirklichkeit und Idee in Heinrich von Kleists Frauenerleben. Diss. Zürich. [Wege zur Dichtung, Bd. 29]. *Frauenfeld, Leipzig*: Huber, 1937. 281 pp. M. 5.70.

Lämke, Dora. — Mittelalterliche Tierfabeln und ihre Beziehungen zur bildenden Kunst in Deutschland. Diss. [Deutsches Werden. H. 14]. *Greifswald*: Bamberg, 1937. 112 pp. M. 3.60.

Lang, Paul. — Schweizer Lyrik der Gegenwart. *Bern*: Fenz, 1937. 32 pp. M. 1.45.

[Langenbacher, Hellmuth. — Deutsche Dichtung in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart. Eine Einführung mit ausgewählten Textproben. *Berlin*: Bong [1937]. 443 pp. M. 4.80.

Lessing, G. E. — Minna von Barnhelm, ed. by W. F. Leopold and C. R. Goedsche. *Boston*: Heath [1937]. xxiii, 273 pp. \$1.20.

[Liljegren, S. B. — The English Sources of Goethe's Gretchen Tragedy. A study of the life and fate of literary motives. [Skrift utg. av Kungl. human. Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund. 24.]. *Lund*: Gleerup; *Leipzig*: Harrassowitz, 1937. vi, 278 pp. M. 7.50.

- Markwardt, Bruno.—Geschichte der deutschen Poetik. Bd. 1. Barock und Frühaufklärung. [Grundriss der germanischen Philologie. 13, 1.] Berlin: de Gruyter, 1937. xi, 457 pp. M. 14.
- Maxwell, W. Cary.—Deutsch in drei Akten. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1937. x, 203 pp. \$1.40.
- Müller, Richard.—Dichtung und bildende Kunst im Zeitalter des deutschen Barock. Diss. Zürich. [Wege zur Dichtung. Bd. 28]. Frauenfeld, Leipzig: Huber, 1937. 133 pp. M. 2.90.
- Mulot, Arno.—Die deutsche Dichtung unserer Zeit. T. 1, Buch 1: Bauerntum in der deutschen Dichtung unserer Zeit. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1937. vii, 80 pp. M. 2.85.
- Naumann, Hans.—Höfisches Lesebuch. Nach Problemen und Motiven ausgewählt und geordnet. 2. Aufl. [Literarhistorische Bibliothek. Bd. 2]. Berlin: Junker & Dünhaupt, 1937. 204 pp. M. 3.40.
- Nordlund, Sven.—Mit Baumnamen gebildete Ortsnamen in Baden. [Uppsala Universitets Arsskrift. 1937, 8]. Uppsala: Lundequist [1937]. xii, 117 pp. Kr. 4.50.
- Petersen, Johannes.—Charakter und Schicksal im Lichte der Dichtung. Ausgewählte literarische Vorträge und Abhandlungen. Eingeleitet und hrsg. von Theodor Lange. Kiel: Mühlaus, 1937. 140 pp. M. 3.
- Petersen, Julius.—Gedächtnisrede auf Konrad Burdach und Arthur Hübner. [Sonderausgabe aus den Sitzungsber. d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. Öffentliche Sitzung vom 1. Juli 1937.] Berlin: de Gruyter u. Co., 1937. 20 pp. 4^o. M. 1.
- Pietzner, Ruth.—Die Natur im Werk Agnes Miegl's. Diss. [Rostocker Studien. H. 2]. Rostock: Hinstorff, 1937. 75 pp. M. 3.
- Purin, C. M.—A Standard German Vocabulary of 2932 Words and 1500 Idioms illustrated in typical phrases and sentences. Boston: Heath [1937]. vi, 186 pp. \$1.00.
- Sachsenspiegel. Niederdeutsche Forschungen und Texte. In Verbindung mit der Wiener Ortsgruppe des Vereins f. niederdeutsche Sprachforschung hrsg. von Heinrich Brömse und Willy Krogmann. Hft. 1: Krogmann, Willy: Ein altsächsisches Lied vom Ende der Welt in hochdeutscher Übersetzung. Berlin N W 7: R. Pfau, 1937. 83 pp. M. 2.80.
- Scenna, Anthony.—The Treatment of Ancient Legend and History in Bodmer. [Columbia Univ. Germanic Studies, N. S. No. 5]. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1937. 168 pp. \$2.50.
- Schachner, Walter.—Das Generationsproblem in der Geistesgeschichte. Mit einem Exkurs über den Hainbund. Diss. [Giessener Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie. 49]. Giessen: von Münchow, 1937. 110 pp. M. 4.20.
- Scheidt, Wilhelm Heinrich.—Von der Weisheit Goethes für die Geschichte. Diss. Berlin: Junker & Dünhaupt, 1937. 126 pp. M. 5.60.
- Schulenburg, Sigrid v. d.—Leibnizens Gedanken und Vorschläge zur Erforschung der deutschen Mundarten. [Abhandl. d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. Phil.-hist. Kl. 1937, 2]. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1937. 37 pp. 4^o. M. 2.50.
- Seuffert, Bernhard.—Prolegomena zu einer Wieland-Ausgabe. 8. Briefwechsel. 1. Hälfte. 1750-1790. [Aus: Abhandlungen d. Preuss. Akademie d. Wiss. Phil.-hist. Kl. 1936, Nr. 11]. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1937. 167 pp. 4^o. M. 10.50.
- Singer, Samuel.—Neue Parzival-Studien. Zürich, Leipzig: Niehans [1937]. 23 pp. M. 1.20.
- Sonntag, Gudrun.—Die Entwicklung einiger Beiworte von Personen in der deutschen Dichtung von der Frühgotik zur Hochgotik. Diss. Teildruck. Breslau: Plischke, 1937. iv, 31 pp.
- Sternbach, Herman.—Stefan George. Ein Versuch. [Aus: Neophilologa. 1937]. Warschau: 1937. 23 pp.
- Stirk, S. D.—Gerhart Hauptmanns "Jesusstudien" in ihrer Beziehung zu dem Roman "Der Narr in Christo Emanuel Quint." Ein Beitrag zum Studium von Hauptmanns Religion. (Vortrag). Breslau: Maruschke & Berendt, 1937. v, 68 pp. M. 3.
- Stiven, Agnes Bain.—Englands Einfluss auf den deutschen Wortschatz. Diss. Marburg. Zeulenroda: Sporn, 1936. 151 pp.
- Stolzenberg, Georg.—Arno Holz und ich. Gedenklblätter. Berlin-Friedenau: Arno-Holz-Archiv [1937]. 31 pp.
- Streitberg, Gerhart.—Die wortgeographische Gliederung Ostsachsens und des angrenzenden Nordböhmens. Diss. Leipzig. [Mitteldeutsche Studien. H. 10 = Teuthonista Beiheft 14.]. Halle: Niemeyer, 1937. 132 pp. M. 9.
- Stumme, Gerhard.—50 Jahre Faust-Sammlung Privatdruck. [Leipzig:] 1937. 36 pp.
- Tiemann, Ilse.—Klopstock in Schwaben. Ein Beitrag zur Geschmacks- und Stammesgeschichte. Diss. [Deutsches Werden. H. 12]. Greifswald: Bamberg, 1937. 271 pp. M. 6.
- Van Dam, J.—Handbuch der deutschen Sprache. Erster Band: Einleitung und Lautlehre. Groningen: J. B. Wolters, 1937. vii, 240 pp. F. 5.90.
- Wendler, Walter.—Gottlob Wilhelm Burmann (1737-1805). Ein Beitrag zur Welt-

u. Lebensanschauung des Bürgertums in d. 2. Hälfte d. 18. Jh. Diss. [Sprache u. Kultur d. germ. u. roman. Völker. B. Bd. 21]. *Breslau*: Priebsch, 1937. vii, 127 pp. M. 4.20.

Wilbrandt, Robert.—Mein Vater Adolf Wilbrandt. Zu seinem 100. Geburtstag. *Leipzig*: H. Haessel, 1937. 72 pp. M. 1.50.

Wolf, Hans L.—Studie über die Natur bei Hans Sachs. Diss. Heidelberg. *Philippsburg*: Kruse, 1937. 116 pp.

Wossidlo, Richard, und Teuchert, Hermann.—Mecklenburgisches Wörterbuch. Mit Unterstützung der Mecklenb. Landesregierung herausgegeben. [Etwa 40 Lieferungen]. Lfg. 1: A-afkabehehn. *Neumünster*: Wachholtz, 1937. xv pp., 128 cols. 4°. M. 2.40.

FRENCH

Andrus, L. R.—A study of subjunctive usage in the *Roman de Troie*. Abstract of Cornell diss., 1936. 6 pp.

Anglisani, A.—G. G. Rousseau, il profeta della Rivoluzione. *Antwerp*: Serio et Molinaro, 1936. 38 pp.

Becker, Ph. A.—Fauvel u. Fauvelliana. *Leipzig*: Hirzel, 1936.

Bond, O. F.—Première étape. Basic Fr. readings. *Boston*: Heath, 1937. xxii + 289 pp. \$1.20.

— Vocabulary drill book. *Boston*: Heath, 1937. iv + 28 pp. \$0.24.

Busse, C. A.—Das regionalistische Programm bei M. Barrès. Diss. *Greifswald*: 1936. 85 pp.

Carter, B. G.—The French realists and the theatre. Abstract of a U. of Ill. diss., 1937. 18 pp.

Cavallucci, G.—L'œuvre litt. de Rouget de Lisle. *Naples*: Pironti, 1936. 21 pp.

Chiri, G.—L'epica lat. medioevale e la Chanson de Roland. *Genoa*: Degli Orfini, 1936. 263 pp.

Craveri, R.—Voltaire, politico dell'illuminismo. *Turin*: Einaudi, 1936. 183 pp.

Ebert, J.—Maurice Barrès u. die Rheinfrage. *Greifswald*: Dallmeyer, 1936. 70 pp.

Engelmeyer, O.—Die Deutschlandideologie der Franzosen. *Berlin*: Junker u. Dünhaupt, 1936. 142 pp.

Falla, H. E.—Le Parler de France. Part I. *Oxford*: Basil Blackwell, [1937]. xii + 144 pp. 2 sh 3 d.

Flore et Blanchefor, ed. W. Wirtz. Diss. *Frankfort*: 1937. 190 pp.

Gabriel, A.—Index romain et litt. fr. à l'époque romantique. *Budapest*: Inst. fr., 1936. 92 pp.

Gelobter, H.—Le Spectateur von P. Marivaux u. d. englischen Moralischen Wochenschriften. Diss. *Frankfort*: 1936. 94 pp.

Greve, M.—Die Aufklärung u. das Wirken des modernen Geistes im neuzeitlichen Frankreich. Diss. *Münster*: 1936. 163 pp.

Hartmann, K.—*—* für g. Diss. *Jena*: 1936. ix + 38 pp.

Hitz, M. F.—Die Redekunst in Bourdaloues Predigt. Diss. *Munich*: 1937. 138 pp.

Hocke, G. R.—Lukrez in Frankreich von der Renaissance bis zur Revolution. Diss. *Bonn*: 1935. vi + 184 pp.

Holmes, U. T., Jr.—A History of O. Fr. Lit. *Chapel Hill*: R. Linker, 1937. xiii + 351 pp.

Kurzweil, A. E.—La crise de la famille dans le roman fr. contemp. *Budapest*: Inst. fr., 1937. 78 pp.

Levy, Raphael.—Répertoire des lexiques du vieux fr. *New York*: MLA, 1937. x + 65 pp. \$1.00.

Löpelmann, M.—Villon, Dichtungen. Franz. u. deutsch, mit Einleit. u. Anmerk. *Munich*: Callwey, 1937. 228 pp.

Lohde, R.—Die Anthropologie Pascals. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1936. vii + 83 pp.

Mackay, Mona E.—Meredith et la France. *Paris*: Boivin, 1937. 297 pp. Fr. 45.

Natoli, G.—Stendhal. *Bari*: Laterza, 1936. 265 pp.

Pesquidoux et Bellessort.—Le fauteuil de J. Bainville. Discours de réception à l'Acad. fr. et réponse. *Paris*: Plon, 1937. 117 pp. Fr. 15.

Peter, Louise.—Das Naturgefühl bei Maurice de Guérin. *Zurich* diss., 1935. 71 pp.

Pons Bounous, A.—Molière e la commedia francese nel secolo XVII. *Rome*: Università, 1936.

Rudwin, M.—Les écrivains diaboliques de France. *Paris*: Figuière, 1937. 188 pp.

Runkewitz, W.—Der Wortschatz der Grafschaft Rethel in Beziehung zur modernen Mundart nach dem "Trésor des Chartes du Comté de Rethel." *Leipzig*: Noske, 1937. xiv + 214 pp.

Saint Alexis, la Vie de, ed. V. Todesco. *Florence*: La nuova Ital., 1936. 91 pp.

Schultz-Gora, O.—Folque de Candie von Herbert Le Duc de Danmartin. III. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1936. vi + 450 pp.

Scott, Mary W.—Art and Artists in Balzac's *Comédie humaine*. Part of a Chicago diss., 1936. 46 pp. (lithoprinted.)

Servais, T. H.—G. Flauberts Urteile über d. franz. Lit. Diss. *Münster*: 1936. 135 pp.

Tappolet, E.—Patois de la Suisse romande. Canton du Valais: Evolène. *Leipzig*: Harrassowitz, 1936. 11 pp.

Vinet.—Etudes sur B. Pascal, éd. P. Kohler. *Lausanne*: Payot, 1936. clxiv + 354 pp.

Weirich, R.—Schillers Auffassung von der Kunst als einer erziehenden Macht u. ihre Bedeutung für die franz. Lit. Diss. *Munich*: 1936. 130 pp.

Wittrock, W.—Der Gottesbegriff im Werk A. Gides. Diss. *Marburg*: 1936. 71 pp.

Yu Houo Joei.—Prosper Mérimée romancier et nouvelliste. Lyons diss., 1935. 224 pp.

ITALIAN

Alfieri, V.—La Congiura de' Pazzi. Edited with Introduction, Notes and Vocabulary by Clarence King Moore. D. C. Heath, 1937. Pp. xiii + 105. \$1.00.

Antoniade, C.—L'Arétin, Guichardin, Benvenuto Cellini. *Paris*: Desclée de Brouwer, 1937. 336 pp. Fr. 20.

Ascarei, Tiziano.—Vittorio Alfieri. *Torino*: Paravia, 1937. 106 pp. L. 5.

Blasi, Ferruccio.—Le poesie del trovatore Arnaut Catalan. (Introduzione, testi, traduzioni, note). *Firenze*: Olschki, 1937 (Biblioteca dell' "Archivum Romanicum," serie I, 24). xxxii + 62 pp. L. 40.

Bonfatti, Giuliano.—Lo studio della natura nell'Umanesimo. *Mantova*: La Voce di Mantova, 1937. 77 pp.

Bovio, L.—Poesia e dolore di V. Colonna. *Napoli*: Rispoli, 1937. 39 pp. L. 5.

Brugini, B.—Leopardi a Recanati. *Modena*: Guanda, 1937. 104 pp. L. 7.

Brugioni, Benedetto.—Leopardi a Recanati. Saggi critici e commenti su i più bei canti di Recanati. *Modena*: Guanda, 1937. 102 pp. L. 7.

Burgada, G.—Libri rari. *Milano*: Mondadori, 1937. 180 pp. L. 12.

Busetto, N.—Il senso storico e la idealizzazione epica della storia nella poesia italiana. *Padova*: Cedam, 1937. 29 pp. L. 5.

Capasso, Aldo.—La lirica di G. D'Annunzio. Tomo I. *Adria*: "Tempo nostro," 1937. 541 pp.

—Scrittori d'oggi. Tomo I. *Savona*: S. T. E. R., 1937. 332 pp.

—Ricerche di "Aura poetica." *Savona*: Ster, 1937. 330 pp. L. 12.

Casanostra (II).—Strenna recanatese. (Raccolta di studi e documenti leopardiani). *Recanati*: tip. Simboli, 1937. 85 pp.

Cesareo, G. A.—Leopardi poeta d'amore. Prefazione di Maria Cesareo. *Palermo*: Trimarchi, 1937. 32 pp. L. 3.

Cino da Pistoia. Nel VI centenario della morte. A cura del Comitato pistoiese per le onoranze. *Pistoia*: A. Pacinotti e C., 1937. Pp. 159 con una tavola. (Scritti di Solmi, Chiappelli, Monti, Pernicone, Zaccagnini, Di Benedetto, Landini.)

Costa, Ugo.—Codice delle biblioteche

italiane. *Milano*: Mondadori, 1937. 451 pp. L. 18.

Cristofari, M.—Il Codice Marciano ital. XI, 66. *Padova*: Cedam, 1937. 96 pp. L. 12.

Culcasi, Carlo.—Poesis: ritmica e metrica italiana. *Torino*: S. Lattes, 1938. 124 pp. L. 6.

D'Annunzio, Gabriele.—Prose scelte, a cura di D. Pastorino. *Milano*: Mondadori, 1937. 374 pp. L. 15.

Farinelli, A.-G.—Leopardi. *Roma*: R. Accademia d'Italia, 1937. 26 pp. L. 5.

Foscolo, Ugo.—Dell'origine e dell'ufficio della letteratura. Orazione. Con prefazione e note di Egidio Bellorini. *Torino*: Paravia, 1937. xiv + 36 pp. L. 3.

Galeani, Giuseppe.—Tre poeti della scapigliatura. (Praga, Boito, Camerana). *Sora*: tip. D'Amico, 1937. 85 pp.

Guardini, R.—Der Engel in Dantes Göttlicher Komödie. *Leipzig*: Hegner, 1937. 134 pp. M. 3.50.

Libro (II) italiano: Rassegna bibliografica generale. Anno I-N 1-6. *Roma*: Libreria Ulpiano editrice, Giugno, 1937. (Pubblicazione mensile.)

Malagoli, Luigi.—I Ricordi del Guicciardini e la civiltà del Rinascimento. *Firenze*: La nuova Italia, 1937. 36 pp. L. 6.

Metastasio, Pietro.—Attilio Regolo. Con introduzione, commenti, note e appendice di Ettore Allodoli. *Palermo*: Sandron, 1937. 96 pp. L. 3.50.

Migliorini, Bruno.—Lingua contemporanea. *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1937. 102 pp.

Momigliano, Attilio.—Studi di poesia. *Bari*: Laterza, 1938. 252 pp. L. 18.

Mostra di autografi e carteggi di Giacomo Leopardi. (R. Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio Emanuele III, Napoli.) Prefazione di Antonio Boselli. *Napoli*: tip. Contessa, 1937. 36 pp. con quattro tavole.

Nievo, Ippolito.—Le confessioni di un ottuagenario. Vol. I e II. Sesto San Giovanni (*Milano*): A. Barion, 1937. 447; 463 pp.

Paoli, U. E.—Il latino di Folengo. *Firenze*: Le Monnier, 1937. 28 pp.

Peritore, G. A.—La Poesia del Carducci. (Prefazione di Giulio Bertoni). *Modena*: Soc. tip. Modenese, 1937. xi + 176 pp. L. 10.

Pietrobono, Luigi.—Pascoli e il mistero. *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1937. 23 pp. L. 3.

Pirandello, Luigi.—Il fu Mattia Pascal. *Milano*: Mondadori, 1937. xiv + 294 pp. L. 12.

Portier, L.—Antonio Fogazzaro. *Paris*: Boivin et Cie., 1937. xi + 480 pp. Fr. 60.

Rieszkowski, B.—Studi sul Platonismo del Rinascimento in Italia. *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1937. 170 pp. L. 30.

Ruffini, Mario.—I Poeti del "dolce stil nuovo." *Torino*: Paravia, 1937. 119 pp. L. 5.

Santangelo, S.—G. A. Cesareo. *Palermo*: Trimarchi, 1937. 44 pp. L. 3.50.

Scalia, S. Eugene.—Carducci: His Critics and Translators in England and America, 1881-1932. *New York*: S. F. Vanni, 1937. 103 pp.

Scarano, Nicola.—Storia della letteratura italiani. Vol. I: Introduzione, le origini, Dante, Petrarca, Boccaccio, i Trecentisti minori, il Quattrocento. *Milano*: La prora, 1937. 210 pp. L. 10.

Schilirò, Vincenzo.—Come vedo Pirandello. 2a ediz. *Torino*: Soc. Ed. Internazionale, 1937. 140 pp. L. 7.

Sciortino, Giuseppe.—Esperienze antidannunziane. 2a ediz. *Palermo*: Sandron, 1937. 98 pp. L. 7.

Sica, Concetta.—Vis comica e pregi artistici nelle commedie di Vittorio Alfieri. *Napoli*: Pironti, 1937. 91 pp.

Stea, Raffaello.—La tragedia nell'ideale romantico e nella concezione di G. Mazzini. *Trani*: tip. Paganelli, 1937. viii + 113 pp. L. 10.

Tanzillo, Rachele.—Il realismo nella prosa narrativa e drammatica di Gabriele D'Annunzio. *Napoli*: Rondinella, 1937. 47 pp.

Tasso, Torquato.—La Gerusalemme liberata. Introduzione e commenti di O. Castellino. *Torino*: S. Lattes, 1938. 511 pp. L. 15.

Tristano (II) corsiniano. A cura di Michele Galasso. Con prefazione di Giulio Bertoni. *Cassino*: ed. Le fonti, 1937. 135 pp. con una tavola. L. 20.

Valgimigli, Manara.—Pascoli e la poesia classica. *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1937. 32 pp. L. 3.

Venturi, Raffaele.—Breve saggio sui "Nutricia" del Poliziano. *Pergola*: tip. Guidarelli, 1937. 15 pp. L. 2.50.

Violini, C.—Lorenzo il Magnifico. *Milano*: La prora, 1937. 390 pp. L. 15.

Viviani, Alberto.—Giacomo Leopardi. *Roma*: Formiggini, 1937. 215 pp. con ritratto. L. 5.

Zaccagnini, Guido.—Giuseppe Giusti. *Pistoia*: Tariffi, 1937. vii + 207 pp. con ritratto. L. 12.

Zamboni, Armando.—Pascoli. *Torino*: Paravia, 1937. 122 pp. L. 5.

Zizzo, Giuseppe.—Figure e paesi de "I Promessi Sposi." *Catania*: tip. Viaggio-Campo, 1937. 56 pp. L. 5.

SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE

Arios Sanjurjo, J.—Avellaneda y el sentido oculto del "Quijote." *Santiago*: Paredes, 1935. 32 pp.

Bataillon, M.—Erasmus et l'Espagne. *Paris*: Droz, 1937. lix + 904 pp. Fr. 100.

Brett, E.—Nineteenth Century Spanish Plays. *London*: Appleton-Century, 1935. ix + 889 pp.

Callcott, F.—Los Puritanos y otros cuentos. *Boston*: Heath, 1937. vi + 90 pp. \$0.40.

Cervantes.—La Gitanilla, ed. Castillo and Sparkman. *V. Boston*: Heath, 1937. iv + 60 pp. \$0.28.

Edel, R.—Blasco Ibáñez in s. Verhältnisse zu einigen neueren franz. Romanschriftstellern. Diss. *Münster*: 1935. 121 pp.

Figueiredo, F. de.—Ponto de vista para uma introd. á historia comp. das lits. portuguesa e espanhola. *Lisbon*: Empresa Nac. de Publicidade, 1935. 194 pp.

Guerrieri, C. C.—Juan de la Cueva e le origini del teatro naz. spagnuolo. *Turin*: Gambino, 1936. 223 pp.

Isla.—Gil Blas, retold and ed. C. Castillo and C. F. Sparkman. IV. *Boston*: Heath, 1937. iv + 60 pp. \$0.28.

Kästner, E.—Emilio y los detectives, trans. and ed. F. de Onís and W. M. Barlow. *Boston*: Heath, 1937. iv + 204 pp. \$0.84.

Kidder, Margaret.—A crit. ed. of *El Bernardo* of Bernardo de Balbuena. Abstract of Ill. diss., 1937. 8 pp.

Kretschmann, W.—Die Kausalsätze u. Kausalkonjunktionen in d. altspan. Literatur-sprache. Diss. *Hamburg*: 1936. 102 pp.

Lodge, L. F.—Angelica in *El Bernardo* and *Las Lágrimas de Angélica*. Abstract of Ill. diss., 1937. 6 pp.

Paiva Boléo, M. de.—A metáfora na língua portuguesa corrente. *Coimbra*: Coimbra Ed., 1935. 41 pp.

—O perfeito e o pretérito em português. *Ibid.*: Bibl. da Univ., 1937. xliii + 130 pp.

Palhano-Curci, F. de.—Nouvelle méthode pratique de portugais commercial. *Paris*: Jablonski, 1936. 206 pp. Fr. 12.

Switzer and Lee.—A la conquista de la lengua esp. 2 v. *Boston*: Heath, 1937. 110 + 124 pp.

GENERAL

Amades, J.—Cançons populars amoroses i cavalleresques. *Tárrega*: F. Camps Calmet, 1935.

Bergh, Åke.—La déclinaison des mots à radical en s en provençal et en catalan. *Göteborg*: Wettergren & Kerber, 1937. 95 pp.

Kress, Bruno.—Die Laute des modernen Isländischen. [Arbeiten aus d. Inst. f. Lautforschung an d. Univ. Berlin. Nr. 2]. *Leipzig*: Harrassowitz, 1937. x, 181 pp. M. 9.

Puscariu, S.—Etudes de linguistique roumaine. *Cluj*: Impr. națională, 1937. xix + 508 pp.

1938

agne.
100.
anish
5. ix

entona.
40.
and
iv +

iltnis
hrift-
p.
para
ortu-
Nac.

e le
uria:

estillo
leath,

tives,
arlow.
0.84.
Ber-
act of

ze u.
ratur-
pp.
o and
of Ill.

ingua
a Ed.,

ingua.
30 pp.
thode
Paris:

de la
. 110

oroses
almet,

ots a
talan.
95 pp.
ernen
Laut-
Leip-
M. 9.
stique
7. xix

Conrad Ferdinand Meyer

HUTTENS LETZTE TAGE

EDITED BY R. B. ROULSTON

This edition of Meyer's "Hutten" has been undertaken with two aims in view: first, to establish the true history of the text of that work of the Swiss poet, and second, to render accessible to students of Meyer, within the compass of one volume, all of the material necessary for the study of his poem, both textually and historically. As is well known, some of the editions here presented have become so rare that their existence has become almost legendary. The first, third, fifth, and tenth editions have been reproduced in their entirety and synoptically, so that the scholar at a glance may see the development of any specific part of the text from the original edition to the "Ausgabe letzter Hand." The second, fourth, sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth editions have, where they differ from the edition immediately preceding, been cited by line instead of merely by word, so that a clearer conception of any one of the editions not reproduced may be gained. The results achieved by this edition show conclusively that the many references in the literature to the history of the text of Meyer's "Hutten" and as to what constitutes the "Ausgabe letzter Hand" are, even to the latest bibliography, based upon insufficient evidence and are consistently incorrect. This volume may be considered as establishing the foundation for all future studies of "Huttens letzte Tage."

xviii + 238 pages, 4to, cloth, \$3.00

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE

EDMUND SPENSER

A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SUPPLEMENT

By DOROTHY F. ATKINSON

The purpose of this volume is two-fold. It attempts, in the first place, to fill a need on the part of Spenser scholars for an annotated bibliography which will supplement Dr. Frederic Ives Carpenter's *A Reference Guide to Edmund Spenser*. A very considerable amount of Spenseriana has been published since 1923, but, with the exception of one effort in 1928, no attempt has been made to gather into one place all of this material. This the present volume tries to do. In order to reduce as far as possible the inconvenience of using two bibliographical volumes, this work employs the plan and arrangement of Dr. Carpenter's book with which scholars are already acquainted.

In the second place, the work gathers together for the first time a mass of material hitherto omitted from bibliographies of Spenser. Notable among these materials are items from eighteenth and nineteenth century periodicals, notes from county and antiquarian journals, and manuscript theses and dissertations deposited in American college and university libraries.

256 pages, 8vo, cloth, \$3.00

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE

What is the Double-fold Visible Vocabulary?

A device enabling the student to have the vocabulary for each page *either visible or invisible at will*. The Heath double-fold vocabulary editions have the entire vocabulary section (consisting of a full page of vocabulary for every page of text) bound to an extension of the back cover. With the extension unfolded, the student has before him, side by side, the page of text and its corresponding page of vocabulary and notes. To work with the text alone, the vocabulary section is simply folded back into the cover out of sight. Visible or invisible at will!

Gerstcker's GERMELSHAUSEN

Edited with double-fold visible vocabulary and notes by
PAUL K. WHITAKER, University of Kentucky
Paper, \$.40. Limp cloth, \$.48

In preparation: Frschel's HIMMEL, MEINE SCHUHE!

THE HEATH VISIBLE VOCABULARY GERMAN SERIES

AND COMPANY

ANCIENT IRISH TALES

Edited by
TOM PEETE CROSS and CLARK HARRIS SLOVER

The first compendious anthology of ancient Irish epic literature, in English translation. These translations were made by many distinguished scholars, who worked with authentic sources and the stories are probably the most thrilling of all folk tales. The reader will be grateful for the pronouncing glossary of Gaelic names and places. \$3.00

"Warmly recommended to students of Irish and comparative literature, and of social history."—M. R. P. McGuire, *The Catholic Historical Review*

A MAPBOOK OF ENGLISH LITERATURE

Prepared by
JOHN D'AUBY BRISCOE, R. L. SHARP, and M. E. BORISH

A wealth of fascinating information about the geographical background of English literature is contained in these cleverly indexed maps. The paper-bound student's edition is now only 80 cents; a de luxe edition, in boards, bound in red cloth, is priced at \$1.25.

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY

257 Fourth Avenue
 New York